



296 P65e

Pinson \$1.50  
Essays on Anti-  
semitism.

Acc. No. 1242645

JUL 10 '47  
AUG 2 '47

296 P65e

## **Keep Your Card in This Pocket**

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for two weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on this card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



**Public Library**  
**Kansas City, Mo.**

TENSION ENVELOPE CORE

DATE DUE

JUL 19 '47

JUL 15 1950

10527

**MAY 13**









## ESSAYS ON ANTISEMITISM



JEWISH SOCIAL STUDIES

Publications, No. 2

---

# ESSAYS ON ANTISEMITISM

*Edited by*

KOPPEL S. PINSON

Associate Professor of History, Queens College

*With a Foreword by*

SALO W. BARON

Second Edition

Revised and Enlarged

NEW YORK

CONFERENCE ON JEWISH RELATIONS

1946

*Copyright 1946 by The Conference on Jewish Relations, Inc.*

Printed in the United States of America  
at The Comet Press, New York City

## EDITOR'S PREFACE

The warm reception accorded to the volume of *Essays on Antisemitism*, published by the Conference on Jewish Relations in 1942, gave encouragement to the editors of *Jewish Social Studies* to present a new revised and enlarged edition. Antisemitism, far from disappearing from the world scene after the victorious end of the war, is still an ever-present problem for us. Here, where this preface is being written, in the very center of the world's most terrifying and most systematically organized form of antisemitism, where the shattered remnants of once flourishing Jewish communities are ever present before one's eyes, where one meets streams of Jews coming in daily from the new "free" Poland in order to escape mob violence and persecution, here one may easily despair of ever being able to cope with this problem. Yet we dare not lose a sense of broader perspective. If humanity is to survive and with it the Jewish people, a healthy optimism that is under no illusions concerning the tragic complexities of the question and that does not satisfy itself with petty and superficial triumphs is a prime prerequisite. Intelligent study combined with energetic action may still be able to keep this disease from infecting and eventually annihilating our entire civilization.

All the essays in the first edition have also been included in the new edition, most of them in revised form. To this collection have been added the essay on France by Hannah Arendt, the study of German racial antisemitism by Waldemar Gurian and a brief article on the postwar world by the Editor. Grateful appreciation is due to Dr. Joshua Starr for his most valuable aid in the preparation of this volume.

Frankfurt-on-the-Main,  
March 1, 1946.

K. S. P.

24615

1242615

MAY 20 1947





## FOREWORD

Prior to the recent defeat of Germany and its satellites antisemitism had become a world power. Shattering all historical precedents it transcended the boundaries of any particular country or group of countries. While in the throes of defeat it scored a terrifying victory, which may leave ineradicable traces on the destiny of the Jewish people. Unlike its medieval antecedents which, notwithstanding their basic inter-territorial features, operated with considerable independence and lack of simultaneity within the countries of Christendom and Islam, current antisemitic propaganda has extended far beyond the confines of western civilization. It penetrated deeply into the Arabian world, despite the demonstrably greater "Semitism" of the Arab-speaking peoples when compared with the bulk of westernized Jewry. It penetrated the far reaches of Japan, despite the numerical and economic inferiority of its Jewish community and the total absence of an anti-Jewish tradition. In former ages, moreover, it was primarily an instrument of domestic policy, but in our day it has constituted a pre-eminent factor in international relations. The melancholy adage of a third-century Palestinian sage, living in an era of great Jewish sufferings, that "he who persecutes Israel becomes a chief" (*Sanhedrin* 104b), often borne out by the history of domestic rivalries and the successful careerism of individual antisemites, has perhaps for the first time in the ages of Jew-baiting, come true on the world scene. The fanciful, conspicuously spurious accusation of the alleged Jewish drive for world dominion has served as a powerful vehicle of the realistic Teuton attempt at gaining complete mastery over the world.

To be sure, the tidal wave of Nazi antisemitism may have reached its apex in 1939 when, beginning with the German conquest of Czechoslovakia, it revealed its hidden imperialist aims even to uncritical minds. Such nations as the Poles, who but a few years ago had themselves been seized by the antisemitic frenzy, and have since tragically learned the true meaning of the anti-Jewish *furor teutonicus*, are still largely hostile to the small body of surviving Jews. Nevertheless, the speed and ease with which antisemitic agitators spread the new gospel before 1939 and, overtly or surreptitiously, still do it in various countries has shocked

## FOREWORD

Jews and liberal-minded Christians alike, and stirred them out of an age-old complacency.

Unfortunately the Jews themselves can do relatively little about combatting antisemitic propaganda. Antisemitism clearly being a "disease" of the Gentile nations, only a healthy reaction of the non-Jewish body politic may effectively counteract the spread of its fatal germs. But a sustained reaction of this type can be expected only if the non-Jews themselves feel threatened and realize that their own interests are at stake. The only example in recent history of an effective counter-movement, the Dreyfus affair in France, has shown the efficacy of such awakening of public conscience among progressive non-Jews and of their realization that democracy as such was in danger. To save republican France against a clique of military and clerical reactionaries, the republic rallied and through its spokesmen, Zola, Clémenceau and others, saved both France and the Jewish people from a dangerous assault.

Today again the Jews can merely play a secondary, though no less significant, role in this world-wide conflict. They can help by constantly arousing the conscience of their non-Jewish compatriots and by supplying them with the necessary truthful and reliable information concerning Jews and Judaism so as to answer the mendacious information propagandized by their opponents. In this respect the marshaling of thorough, scientific evidence, although perhaps of little immediate avail with gullible masses, may nevertheless serve as a true "arsenal" for anti-defamation and equip the fighters for democracy with reliable weapons.

To the Jews, on the other hand, a calm and rational investigation of the underlying motivations of various antisemitic movements throughout the ages, of the varying methods used in the dissemination of the antisemitic credo and of its impact upon general and Jewish history, ought to prove of great assistance in obtaining a better understanding of the Jewish position in the contemporary world. Gone is the serenity of ghetto Judaism, which could view antisemitism as but a natural accompaniment to Jewish life in exile. No longer can we take it for granted, as one takes diseases or elementary catastrophes, which one may try to stave off, but whose sheer existence does not undermine morale. Emancipated modern Jewry, actively participating in the life and culture of western nations, can no longer feign indifference to the poisoning of its relations with its non-Jewish neighbors. Thoughtful Jews have learned with great

chagrin that not only are their material interests at stake but that their entire world outlook, all the basic trends in their own modern culture and all their sincere attempts at finding a synthesis of Judaism and western culture, are deeply menaced.

It is hoped that the essays included in the present volume will promote the necessary understanding of the history and psychology of antisemitism by both Jews and non-Jews. While the available literature on antisemitism can easily fill entire libraries, there are few dispassionate, scholarly studies which can give guidance to a serious student of the problem. There are, in fact, large areas in the history of antisemitic movements where even the preliminary accumulation of documentary evidence is still sadly lacking. The present essays, written with care and considerable documentation by experts in their respective fields, will undoubtedly stimulate serious and objective thinking, and serve as an urgent reminder of the need of further, more detailed and even more searching investigations. While not necessarily subscribing to all the views expressed by the respective contributors, the officers of the Conference on Jewish Relations and the editors of *Jewish Social Studies* are, therefore, very glad to submit these essays for the consideration of all interested, thoughtful and critical readers. They are also deeply grateful to the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith for its financial assistance in the publication of the present edition, considerably enlarged and revised, of this volume.

SALO W. BARON  
*President of the*  
*Conference on Jewish Relations*



## C O N T E N T S

Editor's Preface . . . . .	v
Foreword . . . . . <i>Salo W. Baron</i>	vii

### *Part I: ANALYTICAL STUDIES*

Antisemitism in the Post-War World . <i>Koppel S. Pinson</i>	3
The Economic and Social Background of Modern Antisemitism . . . <i>Bernard D. Weinryb</i>	17
Some Remarks on the Psychology of Antisemitism . . . . . <i>I. S. Wechsler</i>	35
Antisemitism and Ourselves . . . . . <i>Z. Diesendruck</i>	41
Defenses Against Antisemitism . . . <i>Jacob R. Marcus</i>	49

### *Part II: HISTORICAL AND REGIONAL STUDIES*

Antisemitism in the Hellenistic-Roman World . . . . . <i>Ralph Marcus</i>	61
Christian-Jewish Relations in the First Millennium . . . . . <i>Solomon Grayzel</i>	79
Jews in Medieval Art . . . . . <i>Joseph Reider</i>	93
The Jews in Medieval Law . . . . . <i>Guido Kisch</i>	103
The Jews and Islam . . . . . <i>Samuel Rosenblatt</i>	112
Antisemitism in Tsarist Russia . . . . . <i>Mark Vishniak</i>	121
Antisemitism in Poland . . . . . <i>Raphael Mahler</i>	145
From the Dreyfus Affair to France Today . . . . . <i>Hannah Arendt</i>	173
Antisemitism in Modern Germany . <i>Waldemar Gurian</i>	218
The Contributors . . . . .	267



*Part I:*  
ANALYTICAL STUDIES





## ANTISEMITISM IN THE POST-WAR WORLD

By KOPPEL S. PINSON

Statesmen and publicists have by now come to realize that the sharp distinction once made between war and post-war problems is no longer valid. Post-war problems are not only created by the preceding war, but the very solutions to them often are born in the very midst of the war. The same holds true for the problem of antisemitism in the post-war world. No consideration of this problem is possible without an analysis of the effects of the war on relations between Jews and their neighbors. We shall, therefore, first analyze the role of antisemitism in our world as influenced by the events of the war.

### I

Liberals and humanitarians writing on the Jewish problem during the 19th and 20th centuries have almost invariably pointed out that the measure of genuine liberalism and democracy in a country is to be found in the treatment accorded by that country to its Jews. It was not until the events of the last decade, however, that this historical truth became patently clear to all intelligent observers of world affairs. The advent of the Hitlerite regime in Germany, but more especially the Nazi war on the rest of the world, has more clearly than ever before in the history of the Jewish problem identified the cause of antisemitism with the forces of political reaction, corruption and aggressive war. The Nazis made antisemitism not only a matter of internal domestic policy; it became the ideological cornerstone of their entire foreign and world policy. They identified all their enemies as Jews or Jew-controlled. Wherever they penetrated and spread their evil power, the first step was the introduction of Nazi racial and antisemitic legislation and the process of liquidation of Jews. In Italy, Poland, Czechoslovakia, France and the Low Countries, it was the same story; the first target was the Jews.

The reverse effect of this policy was that for all opponents of Nazism there developed a greater awareness of the dangers of antisemitism than had hitherto existed. In popular estimation, the clearest and simplest way of identifying a Nazi was by his attitude towards Jews. Fifth columnists and Nazi sympathizers were spotted first by reason of their

antisemitic utterances.<sup>1</sup> To be sure, astute Nazi agents, realizing this, soon made it a point to cover their activities by posing as philo-semites. There is the case of a pro-Nazi professor in an American college who made it his business to have himself selected as faculty adviser to the student Zionist organization and thus camouflage his pro-Nazi activities. However, for most people fighting the Nazis, the following equation came to hold:

$$\text{The Enemy} = \text{Nazi} = \text{Antisemite}$$

Thus more than ever before in the history of the Jew, antisemites came to be identified not merely as the enemies of Jews but as the dangerous enemies of the safety and security of the entire nation. This attitude was reflected in the propaganda activities of the United Nations. The antisemitism of the Nazis was placed in bold relief in the literature and radio programs, in the indoctrination of the armed forces and in the propaganda directed to occupied areas.

The adoption by the Nazis of the racist basis of antisemitism has helped to expose the fallacies of the pompous antisemitic structure they erected. Now, more than ever, new groups of individuals sensed the dangers of antisemitism. Scientists, churchmen, men of affairs, saw the threat of antisemitism more clearly than ever before as a result of the injection of racialism. This ludicrous but at the same time tragic desecration of scientific truth and objective scholarship has opened the eyes of scientists all over the world to the perils of antisemitic and racial doctrines. Anthropologists, biologists, sociologists, historians and political scientists have all contributed to the unmasking of Nazi racialism. As a result, there is hardly a scholar of repute today who would risk his academic and scientific prestige to espouse openly the cause of antisemitism. This is quite a step forward from the days when the cases of a Dohm or a Lessing or a Virchow, as open assailants of antisemitism, were the rare and notable exceptions and when the majority of leading scholars and literateurs shared in the common antisemitic prejudices of their day. The advent of Nazi

<sup>1</sup> An interesting example of this is given by the Anglo-Jewish novelist, Louis Golding, in his piece, "An English Jew Remembers the Blitz," published in the *Contemporary Jewish Record*, vol. v (February, 1942). Describing the mingling of people in a London air-raid shelter, Mr. Golding then tells of a little old lady who kept talking about the Jews and how "the Jews were responsible for it all" and that this was nothing but a "Jewish war" brought on by "those Jewish communities." Then, Mr. Golding recounts, another female voice broke in: "Haven't the Jews suffered enough from those gangsters, those murderers?" she said. "Shame on you! You should go to Germany! Your place is not here!" Then she whipped out her flashlight and shone it full on the other woman's face. "Look at her, everybody," she cried, "look, look! Now you will know her! The spy! The Hitler woman! Pah."

racial "science" has called forth a counter movement in the study of group characteristics, group differences and group prejudices which has gone a long way to educate the scientific and scholarly world as well as the lay public to a better appreciation of the errors and dangers of anti-semitism.<sup>2</sup>

The dissemination of racial antisemitism by the Nazis has had an even greater influence upon the Christian churches. More and more leading Protestants and Catholics have come to realize the full implications of the antisemitic campaign; they have sensed the fact that the fight against the Jew is really a fight against Christianity, that anti-semitism is what Jacques Maritain has called a "psychopathically disguised Christophobia." "Nazi antisemitism," he declares, "is at the very core of the present ordeal of civilization. . . . Nazism begins with antisemitism because antisemitism is the primary symptom and victory of a drive which has no human aim and tends only to annihilation, to the annihilation of the image of God everywhere. . . . It is our own roots, the carnal race of God, which are now lacerated and crushed throughout the world. As a Christian, I know that my God is being slapped in the face by this antisemitic rage. . . ."<sup>3</sup> The term "Judeo-Christian basis" of our Western civilization has come into wide use, and this is a clear indication of the awareness by Christian leaders that Nazi racialism and the assault upon the Jews is but one aspect of a determined policy to carry out in crude and brutal fashion Nietzsche's "transvaluation of values" and overturn the ethical and spiritual foundations upon which our entire civilization rests. Protestant leaders like Karl Barth, Reinhold Niebuhr, the late William Temple, James W. Parkes and Catholic church and lay leaders like Jacques Maritain, Paul Claudel,<sup>4</sup> George Shuster, Justice Frank Murphy and the late Cardinal Hinsley of England have taken a leading part in the ideological as well as the practical fight against antisemitism.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Examples of such literature are *We Europeans*, by Julian Huxley, A. C. Haddon and A. M. Carr-Saunders (London 1935) and *Race, Reason and Rubbish*, by Gunmar Dahlberg (New York 1941).

<sup>3</sup> "World Trial: Its Meaning for the Future," in *Contemporary Jewish Record*, vol. vi (August 1943) 344-45. See also Maritain's *A Christian Looks at the Jewish Problem* (New York 1941) and his article "On Antisemitism" in the *Commonweal*, vol. xxxvi (September 23, 1942) 534-37.

<sup>4</sup> Claudel published his "Catholic Essays Against Antisemitism" at the beginning of the German occupation of France, but they were soon suppressed by the Nazis (See Philip Toynbee in *The New Republic*, January 29, 1945, p. 152).

<sup>5</sup> In the countries occupied by the Nazis, Protestant and Catholic clergymen took a bold stand against the Nazi persecution of the Jews. In Holland, Norway, Belgium, France and Denmark there are numerous instances of such courageous action. Especially noteworthy is the famous pastoral letter against Nazi antisemitic measures issued by Eivand Berggrav, Bishop

It is no accident that the courageous Cardinal Faulhaber of Munich delivered a series of three sermons on the Old Testament in the very first year of Hitler's rule.<sup>6</sup> For the Cardinal well pointed out that Old Testament Judaism is the foundation upon which Christian teaching is built and that the Nazi assault upon Judaism was an attack upon the roots of Christianity itself.<sup>7</sup>

We may agree or disagree with the general lines of political policy of the Vatican. But this much is undisputed fact: never has the papacy spoken in such unmistakable terms against racialism and antisemitism as in the words and deeds of the present pope, Pius XII, and his predecessor Pius XI.<sup>8</sup> In papal encyclicals and in public speeches these two pontiffs have unequivocally denounced antisemitism as dangerous and un-Christian. "Antisemitism," declared Pius XI, "is a movement in which we cannot, as Christians, have any part whatsoever. . . . No, it is not possible for Christians to participate in antisemitism. . . . Antisemitism is inadmissible. Spiritually we are Semites." The papacy took a strong stand against the introduction of racial legislation into Italy in 1938, and the Vatican offered asylum and security to many an Italian Jewish scholar

of Norway, in the winter of 1941 and the courageous pastoral letter of Mgr. Théas, Bishop of Montauban, read at all masses and chapels in the diocese, in which he denounced the mass deportations of Jews. The letter of Mgr. Théas reads as follows: "My dear Brethren: Unhappy and often horrible scenes are taking place in France today—scenes for which France is not responsible. In Paris, by tens of thousands, Jews are being subjected to the most barbarous and savage treatment. And even here in our districts we are witnessing a horrible spectacle—that of families uprooted, of men and women treated as vile beasts and sent to unknown destinations there to face the gravest perils. I proclaim an indignant protest of the Christian conscience and I proclaim that all men, Aryan or non-Aryan, are brothers because they are created by the same God, that all men, whatever their race or religion, have a right to the respect of individuals and of states. But these current antisemitic measures are executed in violation of human dignity, in violation of the sacred rights of the individual and of the family. May God comfort and strengthen those who are so iniquitously persecuted. May He bring to Mankind true and lasting peace founded on justice and charity." See *Free France*, vol. ii, no. 8, 1942, p. 218-19. A similar protest was made by Mgr. Saliege, Archbishop of Toulouse, on August 30, 1942; *ibid.*, vol. ii, no. 6, 1942, p. 159. See also the address of the Cardinals and Archbishops of the occupied zone to Marshal Pétain; *ibid.*, no. 8, p. 218, and the firm attitude of Cardinal Gerlier of Lyons against Nazi antisemitic legislation; *ibid.*, vol. iii, no. 3, 1943, p. 97.

<sup>6</sup> Faulhaber, Michael von, *Judaism, Christianity and Germany* (New York 1938).

<sup>7</sup> "The foes of the Jewish people are waging war not only against the Jews but also against God, and against the values of religion. This ought to be taken into consideration, when watching the present tragedy of Israel." (*Osservatore Romano*, quoted in Cuddihy and Shuster, *Pope Pius XI*, p. 224.)

<sup>8</sup> See especially the important Encyclical of Pius XI, *Mit brennender Sorge*, issued on March 14, 1937, and to be found in Lichtenberger, H., and Pinson, Koppel S., *The Third Reich* (New York 1937) p. 345-68.

who had been removed by the fascist government. With the coming of the war and the mounting tragedy of European Jewry, the annals are full of instances of personal solicitude and direct and immediate help by the Pope to thousands of Jews hounded by the Gestapo. Many a Jewish life was saved by priests and nuns who followed the example set by Pius XII towards the persecuted Jews.<sup>9</sup>

Public men of affairs and statesmen have come to realize how disrupting and disintegrating a force antisemitism can be and how it imperils the very safety and security of the state. There is a greater awareness by a wider number of leaders of public opinion throughout the world that antisemitism is not so much a problem for the Jew to solve as it is for the non-Jewish world. The Jew can help; he can supply expert knowledge and guidance, but the ultimate responsibility for coping with the problem rests with the non-Jew.<sup>10</sup>

Certain positive advances in overcoming antisemitism undoubtedly derive from the actual experiences of the war. The sharing of common experiences, and particularly those of suffering and pain, produces a psychological feeling of comradeship that goes much deeper than intellectual appeals to reason or humanity. The joint participation by Jew and non-Jew in mortal combat against the common enemy will un-

<sup>9</sup> Here are a few examples, taken from news dispatches, that are concrete evidence of Vatican sympathy: On January 9, 1939, Catholic priests in Italy were reported teaching Hebrew to Jewish children in small towns having no Jewish schools. On October 27, 1937, Pius XII, in his first encyclical, scored racialism and totalitarianism. On January 26, 1940, the Vatican invited two Italian Jews, Prof. Tullio Levi-Civita and Prof. Vito Volterra, both ousted by the fascist government from the University of Rome, to attend the congress of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences. On March 1, 1940, Pius XII appointed Roberto Almagia, a Jewish geographer, to the Vatican library. On March 13, 1940 the Pope was reported to be emphatic in his denunciation of religious and racial persecution to von Ribbentrop. On April 30, 1940, the *Regime Fascista* attacked the Vatican organ, the *Osservatore Romano*, as "a slave of Italy's enemies and manifestly a mouthpiece of the Jews." On October 17, 1943, the Jews of Rome, with the help of Pius XII, paid a collective fine of fifty kilograms of gold to the Nazis as ransom for 100 Jewish hostages, who nevertheless were not released. According to reports from Rome, soon after the city was liberated from the Nazis, 7,000 Roman Jews owe their lives to the Vatican. Thousands of Catholics risked their lives to save their Jewish neighbors. When the Nazis forbade ritual slaughter of meat and poultry, the Vatican sent *shohetim* into Vatican City to perform the ritual slaughter there and store food for the Jews there. See editorial "True Christianity" in *Congress Weekly*, vol. xi, July 14, 1944. See also the reprint of the article "Civic Charity" from the *Osservatore Romano* in *Congress Weekly*, vol. xi, March 3, 1944.

<sup>10</sup> The National Committee Against Persecution of Jews, headed by Justice Frank Murphy of the U. S. Supreme Court, is a good example of this attitude. "The organization for which I speak," declared Justice Murphy in his address to the B'nai B'rith centennial convention on May 8, 1944, "was organized solely by Christians. It is maintained and its activities are conducted solely by Christians who also finance it completely."

doubtedly create a bond of group friendship that will make appeals to prejudice more difficult. For never before have Jews fought in such vast numbers and with such common devotion against the enemy.<sup>11</sup> The joint sharing of suffering by Jews and non-Jews in bombings, in air raid shelters, in civilian privations, all help to bring Jew and non-Jew closer together. The partnership of Jew and non-Jew in the precarious and heroic activity of the underground movements of liberation in the occupied countries of Europe is an even stronger factor for the mitigation of anti-Jewish feeling.<sup>12</sup> All these aspects of a common experience are factors which cannot be overlooked in any sound prognosis of anti-semitism in the post-war world.

There is one other aspect of the world scene which will do much to mitigate antisemitism, and that pertains to the so-called Communist peril. While we may, as Jews and as citizens, affirm the right of any Jew to hold any political views he may see fit; and while, as historians, we are of course quite correct in refuting the antisemitic identification of Bolshevism with Jews, it nevertheless remains a fact that during the entire period between 1918 and 1939 the blazing fire of antisemitism in the world was fed with more fuel from the bogey of "Jewish Bolshevism" than from any other single charge against the Jews. And while it is obviously not true that all Jews were Bolsheviks, the presence among the leaders of the Russian Bolsheviks of many Jewish figures gave a semblance of authenticity to this antisemitic charge, which fooled many

<sup>11</sup> Good illustrations of this point are found in the articles on Jews in the American Army by Pfc. Harold U. Ribalow, especially "You're in the Army Now" in *Contemporary Jewish Record*, vol. vi (1945) 366-70, and "How Soldiers Destroy Hate," in *Congress Weekly*, vol. x (December 3, 1945) 8-10. A typical case cited is that of Dan Middleton of Providence, Rhode Island. "Gee," said Dan, "when I came into the army I thought that all Jews were home makin' the dough. . . . But wherever I go I find Jewish soldiers. Hell, there are more Jews in this army than there are in Jerusalem." See also the interesting cabled dispatch by Anne O'Hare McCormick on American soldiers in Tel Aviv, in the *New York Times*, January 6, 1945. On statistical data regarding Jews in the U. S. Army see the pamphlet, *Fighting for America*, published by the National Jewish Welfare Board (New York 1944).

<sup>12</sup> For examples of such partnership in the French resistance movement see the reprint of the pamphlet issued by the United Underground movements in August 1942 reminding the French people of the crimes against the Jews in *Free France*, vol. ii, no. 12 (1942) 369; see also the reprint of "Our Brothers, the Jews" from the resistance paper, *Combat*, in the *Contemporary Jewish Record*, vol. vi (1945) 414-15. In Norway we have the instance of Otto Nansen, son of the famous Fritjof Nansen, leader of the Norwegian underground who was captured and placed in a concentration camp for aiding Jews. He was made to wear a huge yellow Star of David with the inscription "I am a Jewish slave." For examples of such joint partnership in Poland, see Karaki, Jan, *The Secret State* (New York 1944), and more especially Mendelsohn, S., *The Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto*, issued by the Yiddish Scientific Institute (New York 1944).

an honest but naive Christian. The active leadership of men like Trotzky, Kamenev, Zinoviev, Radek, Joffe and Litvinov in the councils of the Soviet Union is a thing of the past. As a result of the various purges of Old Bolsheviks carried out by Stalin there is only one person of Jewish extraction of any prominence among the Soviet leaders, Lazar Kaganovich, and for the past several years he too has receded into the background. The scare of Jewish Bolshevism has not even a semblance of fact to feed on any longer.

## II

All the above-mentioned factors illuminate what may be called the positive side of the balance sheet of post-war antisemitism. They are all forces or tendencies, existing in varying strength in different parts of the world but present all over, that make for a more optimistic and brighter prognosis regarding the prospects of antisemitism in the post-war world. These factors have led some writers to predict the complete collapse of antisemitism after the war is over. Dr. James W. Parkes of England, noted student of the history of antisemitism, believes this to be probable, while a further example of such extreme optimism is afforded by the Anglo-Jewish journalist, William Zuckerman. "During the last decade of bloodshed and suffering," writes Zuckerman, "the world has learned that humanity is one and indivisible; that it is not possible to persecute, humiliate and exterminate one people without affecting all the others; and that by helping one, all are helped. The world is not likely to forget this great lesson so soon; it has paid too dearly for it. That is why antisemitism as a movement is now more discredited than it has ever been in the last century, and that is why it will, in all probability, remain a dead issue after the war in spite of the huge Nazi propaganda."<sup>13</sup>

The picture is not all bright, however. We must not delude ourselves into a utopian dream that the victorious end of the war and the triumph over Nazism has purged the world of the cardinal tenet of Nazi doctrine. There are circumstances and situations arising out of Nazi rule and out of the war that bear within them the seeds of new antisemitic problems.

For over fifteen years the entire world and the continent of Europe have been fed on the poisonous propaganda of the Nazi antisemitic machine. Since 1933 this machine has had the backing of a powerful state apparatus. Millions of dollars have been spent and millions of tons of litera-

<sup>13</sup> Zuckerman, W., "Auguries of a New Europe," in *Contemporary Jewish Record*, vol. vi (February 1943) 48.

ture have been distributed in Europe, in the United States, in Latin America and in South Africa for the sole purpose of fostering Jew-hatred. To the general ignorance regarding Jews already prevalent among non-Jews has now been added a mass of slander, lies, half-truths and distortions regarding Jews and Judaism that will not easily be eradicated. It is difficult for one who has not lived under a dictatorship to realize how almost utterly hopeless is the task of retaining a sense of critical judgment and healthy skepticism when fed daily with nothing but official propaganda and with the total absence of any information or factual material whereby to gauge and evaluate this propaganda in its true perspective. Generations of young people, not only in Germany, but in most countries of Europe, have grown up during their most impressionable years with distorted notions regarding Jews which will be extremely difficult if not impossible to correct. Defeated though they are in the war, there are many things which the Nazis will leave to the world as *faits accomplis*, which they may well chalk up as victories for themselves. And one of these, apart from the physical liquidation of Central and East-European Jewry, is the world-wide dissemination of the poisonous virus of antisemitism which will remain to plague the victorious United Nations for many years to come.

We may look, too, to considerable friction growing out of the return of Jews to their former homes. Let us not consider Germany itself. The number of Jews remaining in Germany will be very small. But the return of Jews to liberated countries, even though under free and democratic governments, will not be achieved without sowing seeds of potential hostility. The problems of resettlement of Jews in their former homes and especially the restoration of their property are meeting with considerable antagonism on the part of the native populations. Jews returning to France or to Belgium or to Czechoslovakia do not find their former homes vacant or their former economic positions unoccupied. On the contrary, these positions have been taken over by "Aryans" who are showing no inclination to give them up in favor of the returning Jews. In many cases, non-Jews who now own property formerly belonging to Jews acquired it through perfectly legal means.<sup>13a</sup> Not infrequently, too, it has passed through several hands before coming into their possession, so that they are altogether unaware of the fact that it was confiscated from the Jews. Such persons will be entirely unwilling to surrender what they

<sup>13a</sup> In the case of corporate business organizations, the Nazis were almost always scrupulously careful to distribute the shares of former Jewish owners to "Aryans" through perfectly legal business transactions.



regard as rightfully theirs. Indications of the seriousness of this problem are already evident in liberated France, Rumania and Bulgaria. In France an association was formed of Frenchmen holding former Jewish property to protect themselves against the returning Jews. This is a gloomy foreboding of how serious the problem can become in countries where the antisemitic tradition has been more powerful than in France.

Another source of potential danger to the Jews of Central and Eastern Europe is found in the changed attitude towards national minorities. Here the experiences with German minority groups during the past fifteen years has been crucial. For many years, German theorists of nationalism have developed a distinction between the *Staatsnation* or political nation, and the *Kulturnation* or cultural national group. A theory of protection of cultural rights of national minorities was erected upon this foundation, which served as the ideological basis for the system of minority protection established after World War I. Jewish nationalist leaders and thinkers were deeply influenced by these German theories, and Jews worked intimately during the post-war period with leaders of German minority groups in establishing the Congress of Minorities and in pleading the cause of minority protection before the League of Nations and before world opinion. Little did they realize that all these German cultural agencies, scattered throughout the world in strategic places, would be destined to become nerve centers of Nazi fifth column activities designed to undermine the structure of the states in which they resided.<sup>14</sup> The disruptive influence of the Sudeten Germans between 1933 and 1939 gave the world a particularly illuminating example of how a powerful mother state can use its national minorities in other states as instruments of its foreign policy.<sup>15</sup> Small wonder, therefore, that the leaders of the various governments-in-exile became wary of once again assuming the responsibilities and dangers of national minority rights. Instead, the tendency now seems to be toward the elimination of national minority problems by wholesale shifts and exchanges of population in order to attain national homogeneity in each of the reconstituted states. The precedents of the wholesale population shifts already carried out by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union have given added weight to the argument for such a solution of the problems.

<sup>14</sup> For a detailed account of this process see Bischoff, Ralph F., *Nazi Conquest Through German Culture* (Cambridge 1942), and a review of the same by the author in *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. vi (1944) 78-79.

<sup>15</sup> "It remains a fact," writes Dr. Hubert Ripka, Czechoslovak minister of state, "that the majority of the 'Sudeten Germans' inclined to Henleinism, that they readily accepted the rule of the Swastika and actively spread it in the German, Czech, Slovak and Carpathian regions

Czechoslovakia, a state which adhered more closely to the spirit as well as the letter of the minorities provisions of the last peace, but the first state to suffer disruption at the hands of a disloyal minority, has also been the first to advocate population transfers as the solution to the minority problem. President Benes and other Czechoslovak leaders have come out for a forcible transfer of all German residents of Czechoslovakia to Germany and the forced de-Germanization of any that remain. In several articles and speeches Benes has given utterance to a view which is in sharp contrast to the principle of international protection of national minorities.<sup>16</sup> His plan is directed, of course, primarily against the German minority, but it lends itself easily to more general application. In an interview with C. L. Sulzberger, correspondent of the *New York Times*, Benes set forth a four point program as the basis for the solution of postwar problems. Point 3 of this program calls for: "Wholesale exchanges of minorities populations to end *permanently* this troublesome problem. After completion of such transfers, the remaining small minorities would be treated exactly the same as majority populations."<sup>17</sup> "Central and Eastern European federations would then be created as 'commonwealths of homogeneous states.'" Benes declared in this interview that the Versailles system of League protection of minorities was a definite failure. "I think that now," said Benes, "we should begin after this war by reestablishing independent nations and definitely settling questions of their frontiers and, after coming to a decision, completing it by affecting transfers of populations." In a memorandum submitted to the United Nations in December, 1944, the Czech government in London outlined its plan of forcibly transferring about two-thirds of the Sudeten Germans to their "spiritual homeland" and declared that "all Germans allowed to remain in Czechoslovakia after the war must decide to become culturally, as well as politically, citizens of the republic."<sup>18</sup> In place of national rights the Czech leaders will grant only individual human rights. "In the future," said Benes in his interview with Sulzberger, "it should not be possible in Europe either to create by the use

of our Republic." (Reprinted from *Central European Observer* in *News Flashes from Czechoslovakia*, February 15, 1943.) This view is also corroborated by Josef Lading, one of the leaders of the German Social Democratic Labor Party of Czechoslovakia.

<sup>16</sup> See especially "The New Order in Europe" in *The Nineteenth Century*, vol. cxxx (1941) 150-55, and "The Organization of Post War Europe" in *Foreign Affairs*, vol. xx (1942) 226-42; see also the reprint of his Chicago address of May 22, 1943 in *United Nations Review*, vol. iii (1943) 237.

<sup>17</sup> *New York Times*, February 18, 1943.

<sup>18</sup> *New York Herald Tribune*, December 7, 1944.

of minority treaties or minority laws a special state in another state and prepare a large fifth column for a period of crisis or war, as we have seen it happen in the present war. We must base national rights on human rights alone as you do in the United States." <sup>19</sup>

The model set by Czechoslovak leaders is also being followed by Polish leaders. In a United Press dispatch from Lublin of January 11th, 1945, Henry Shapiro writes: "The new Poland now in process of formation will be a self-consciously nationalistic nation, its population as purely Polish as possible and free of minority races which have given rise to vexing (problems) ever since the Versailles settlement." This is the opinion he finds prevalent among Polish leaders of all shades of opinion. All "appear determined to build their future in a state purged of troublesome minorities." <sup>20</sup> In Rumania, the Soviet-sponsored new government declared, on November 19th, 1944, that Jews in Rumania will no longer be considered as a national minority but as Rumanians of the Jewish religion. "Jews are not a minority and not a nationality," declared the Rumanian minister of nationalities, "and they must be treated and considered just like all other Rumanians."

The tendency everywhere in Europe seems to be towards the creation of monolithic national states with an intensification of nationalism, born out of national resistance against the Germans. This in itself is a source of potential danger to Jews. Any kind of intensified nationalism is almost inevitably accompanied by an exclusivism which looks askance at groups who do not lend themselves to complete absorption into the national Leviathan. Jews are the first to suffer from such intensified nationalism.

This tendency towards a monolithic nationalism coupled with a decided hostility to minority groups represents to my mind one of the most serious problems for the collective Jewry of Central and Eastern Europe in the post-war world. For what makes the problem more difficult for the Jew, however, is that Jews are everywhere a minority. No matter what transfers of population take place, the Jewish group will always remain a minority group. And in all the claims and counter-claims regarding disputed territories in Eastern Europe—territories which before

<sup>19</sup> On this general question see Vishniak, Mark, *Das transferirn bafelkerungen*, published by the Yiddish Scientific Institute (New York 1942), with the important exchange of letters on the problem between Dr. Max Weinreich and Jan Masaryk, Czech Foreign Minister. See also *Were the Minorities Treaties a Failure?* by the Institute of Jewish Affairs (New York 1943).

<sup>20</sup> *New York Herald Tribune*, January 17, 1945.

the war contained large concentrations of Jewish inhabitants—there is no mention of Jews as a minority group. Each side counts them as its own, without assuming any responsibility towards the Jewish group.

There are, however, two significant examples of an alternative to this tendency; these are the experiments with multi-national states represented by the constitutions of the Soviet Union and of the United States. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is constituted as a federation of many nationalities without the dominance of any single one of them. It is true that in the past twelve to fifteen years there has been an increasingly growing tendency towards Great Russian nationalism, but thus far it has not affected in any material way the nationalities policy dominant in the Soviet Union during its entire history. There is no country in the world more free from the taint of official racialism or official antisemitism than the Soviet Union. No government has done more to combat antisemitism than the Soviet Union; indeed, it may be suggested that it is this aspect of Soviet policy that has most attracted those elements of our Jewish youth who are lured by the promise of Soviet communism.

If the elimination of antisemitism is considered apart from the question of the continued existence of the Jewish people, the Soviet Union may well be on the road to the wiping out of this disease. But those of us who are committed to a positive philosophy of Jewish life cannot feel satisfied with the elimination of antisemitism if that also means the elimination of Judaism, and that is the grave danger in Soviet Jewry. The combatting of antisemitism has been accompanied by a terrific pace of assimilation of the Jews. There are many erroneous notions regarding the position of Jews in the Soviet Union, and they are widespread even among serious students of Jewish affairs. We should bear certain fundamental facts in mind. In the first place, the general nationalities policy of the Soviet Union is based on the principle: "national in form but socialist in content." That means that whereas the linguistic rights of nationalities are protected and fostered, each cultural group is subjected to the same communist dictatorship. You may extol the virtues of communism or of Josef Stalin in any of the languages of the national groups of the Soviet Union, but the content is the same in all cases. For Jews, whose cultural vitality depends so much on drawing deeply on the historical past of the Jewish people and on close and intimate contacts with other centers of Jewish life, the isolationism of Soviet Jewry, the hostility to Hebrew, to Zionism, to religion, and to older Jewish traditions in general have made for the general atrophy of Jewish cultural life in the Soviet

Union, after a short period of flowering. Moreover, the theory underlying the Soviet nationalities policy is not one that favors the continued existence of the Jewish people as a separate cultural group. The principle of the autonomy of peoples in the U.S.S.R. is based on *territory* and not on *personal* or *individual* status.<sup>21</sup> The Jews are not a territorial minority group; hence we do not find the same *positive* aid to Jewish autonomous cultural life as is given to the territorial nationalities. After a period of great activity in the field of Yiddish cultural life, we have witnessed an enormous decline of Jewish cultural agencies and institutions during the past ten years. Despite the great increase in Yiddish-speaking Jews who have come into the Soviet Union as refugees from Poland, all the old Yiddish newspapers have been discontinued and replaced by a meagre four-page sheet, *Einikeit*. An examination of the files of this sheet will bear witness to the poverty of Jewish cultural life in the Soviet Union and to its disintegrating character. It hardly ever carries news of Jewish interest either from within the Soviet Union or from other countries. Despite the physical and juridical protection of individuals of Jewish extraction in the Soviet Union and notwithstanding the propagandistic utterances of "fellow travellers" in this country, the prospects for the free development of Jewish cultural life in the Soviet Union are anything but bright. The annexation of new areas with large groups of Polish, Lithuanian and Rumanian Jews will make this problem even more serious and of larger dimensions.

The prospects for the free development of Jewish groups are much brighter and the environment more favorable in the United States. While we must obviously not close our eyes to the various antisemitic movements in this country and while it is true that there are certain tendencies in American life that point to a possible development of a strong romantic nationalism, the prevailing and dominant character of American nationalism is still liberal and humanitarian.<sup>22</sup> The wide acclaim and popularity of Russel Davenport's magnificent poem, *My Country*, bears witness to

<sup>21</sup> Dr. Hannah Arendt, otherwise a very acute and brilliant writer on Jewish and general world affairs, reveals the misunderstanding of the Soviet Union's nationalities policy which I mentioned above on this point. In an essay, "Concerning Minorities," in the *Contemporary Jewish Record*, vol. vii (1944) 353-68, Dr. Arendt identifies Soviet policy with the theories of Otto Bauer and Karl Renner on "personal status." The fact is, however, that both Lenin and Stalin violently attacked the Austro-Marxists on this very issue and for the same reason were bitterly hostile to the Jewish Bund. The Soviet policy is based not on "personal status" but on territory, and for Jews this is a tremendous difference.

<sup>22</sup> For an analysis of this special character of American nationalism see the excellent chapter, "Towards a New World" in Hans Kohn's *The Idea of Nationalism* (New York 1944) p. 263-325.

the strength of this character of American nationalism, despite strident and dissonant voices from the other camp.<sup>23</sup>

Moreover, group differences can be freely developed only in a free and democratic society. As Professor R. M. MacIver has well pointed out, multiplicity of groups and democracy are interrelated both in philosophical theory and in historical development. "The totalitarian way," says MacIver, "denies men the right to be different, suppresses all groups that do not conform to a single authoritarian gospel. The . . . democratic way . . . not only admits the right of non-conformity but builds up its political order and its social unity on the free play of differences." "The emergence and differentiation of groups created the challenge to which democracy was the answer."<sup>24</sup> Democracy and multigroup society have grown together; each is a function of the other; the future belongs to them both.

But even in the United States there is grave danger of antisemitic reaction if things do not go well in the post-war period. All the factors mentioned above as identifying Nazi antisemitism with the enemy of our own national security are potentially capable of serious back-fire if our hopes and expectations for the post-war world are not appreciably realized. Then it will once again become a "Jewish War," and all the ills that will beset us will be attributed to the Jews and to the Jewish "causes" of the war. The possibility that such trends may develop, with all the accompanying and resulting manifestations, is one that must always be kept in mind by thoughtful observers. Only the naive utopian will close his eyes to it.

"All tongues and races are American  
All nations are embodied in her job  
To breed the noble concept of a man  
Whose freedom is, that others should be free  
Yellow or black or red or white or tan  
This was the burden of the prophecy,  
When the wharves of Boston, and the whips,  
There rose the blessed words of liberty  
Upon the rebel pens and patriot lips:  
And she was ever generous to those  
Who saw her first as promise from the ships,  
The empty-handed and condemned, who chose  
To risk the towering glamor of her shore;

Italians, Slavs, and Jews, the "dese and dose"  
Who came with song and fiddle and guitar;  
And those of Spain and Crete and Singapore  
In pants of blue and shawls of cinnabar;  
And those of Ayr and Cork; and those who bore  
In them the scars of Pinsk and Bucharest,  
The dusty orts of kaiser, king, and czar,  
Which still she gathered to her mighty breast:  
Whereon the light of liberty sufficed  
To make this hidden splendor manifest—  
And every jewel among them equal-priced  
By her own law, as in the Words of Christ."

(*My Country*, p. 3-4.)

<sup>24</sup> MacIver, R. M., *Towards an Abiding Peace* (New York 1944) p. 110-11.

## THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL BACKGROUND OF MODERN ANTISEMITISM

By BERNARD D. WEINRYB

Antisemitism, just as any other social movement, cannot be reduced to one common denominator to account for the various forms which it has assumed throughout the ages. It has been governed by a number of factors and motives that have changed in various times in accordance with prevailing conditions. It is possible nevertheless to distinguish a number of fundamental characteristics of social life which form the basis for this movement.

Group tensions and specific conflicts between social groups are often dependent on slight differences that are the product of chance or historical development. Such conflicts are to be found not only between various nations and races but even between different groups within the same nation, as for example the antipathy which existed between the various divisions of the German Reich before the second World War. In Poland, prior to its fourth partition, there were tensions between the inhabitants of the former Russian territory and those of Galicia and the district of Posen. Among the Jews there exists a feeling of mutual scorn between the "Litvaks" and the Polish Jews, between both of these groups and the Galician Jews and between all of them and the German Jews. Such a feeling sometimes assumes more concrete form, particularly in the case of conflicting interests between groups. This, too, applies not only to two different peoples or ethnic groups but to divisions within one people as well. In every immigrant country there are conflicts between the newer and the older immigrant groups. Since each new group in a new land brings with it new ways and innovations—whether set customs and forms of life developed in the country of its origin or the desire for a new order which is aroused because of the difficulty of adjustment and acclimation—the "natural" opposition to such a group also acquires a sociological and sometimes an economic coloring. The older groups become intent on safeguarding their positions in the community and the newcomers must take up the challenge and become a "revolutionary" element.

When such a conflict arises between a majority and a minority group,

the points of opposition make for oppression on the part of one group and defensive action on the part of the other. The two processes are sometimes accompanied by the use of a specific phraseology which covers up the real issues involved and at other times the issues themselves are not kept in view. The tension extends then to a far wider sector of the society than is directly affected by the clash of interests or by the economic conflicts.

When a new ethnic or religious group immigrates into an already settled land it usually finds it very difficult to penetrate into the established economic and social positions. It is therefore obliged to seek sources of income which are as yet untapped. The majority will tolerate the minority and allow it to encroach upon its positions only if the newcomers satisfy certain economic needs which do not seriously compete with the activities of the majority. For this reason such groups of newcomers engage, at least for some time, only in a limited number of pursuits, without entering into all of the economic activities of the new country. In the modern period we find this illustrated in the case of the Huguenots who came from France to Germany in the seventeenth century and in the case of the Anabaptists who came from Switzerland to Moravia in the sixteenth century. The French refugees, who settled in about 240 German towns, engaged in business and in branches of industry which were as yet unknown in Germany, such as weaving, soap and glass-making, watchmaking, tobacco growing, etc. The Anabaptists in Moravia became farmers only in isolated cases and the majority engaged in trades which were unknown in Moravia, such as the manufacture of various articles of luxury.

As long as these "strangers" do not compete with the established people they are allowed to live in peace. As soon as their pursuits begin to compete with those of the local people, however, or when their skills are also acquired by others, the struggle against the "strangers" begins. The tension then "spreads" from the economic issues to other points. A few decades after the settlement of the Anabaptists in Moravia the local inhabitants began to raise the cry that they were depriving them of their means of support, at the same time blaming them for their dissension in religious matters. Such complaints were heard time and again during the latter years of the sixteenth century and they led to legal restrictions by the authorities. The growth of this struggle in the next



few years finally brought about the expulsion of 1622. In the same fashion a struggle was conducted by the city dwellers in Germany sometimes against the Huguenots and sometimes against both Huguenots and Jews. Likewise many Hollanders who had settled during the sixteenth century in Frankfurt-am-Main were later forced to leave the city and to settle elsewhere. Similar incidents are to be observed in the case of the Armenians who settled in Poland, as well as in the case of the Jews.

There is no need here to enter into the controversy as to when the Jewish people became predominantly engaged in commerce. Suffice it to say that in the light of modern scholarship we can accept it as a fact that the occupational distribution of Jews was hardly ever similar to that of the peoples among whom they lived. There were always some trades, even "productive" ones, which were considered specifically "Jewish" and others in which the Jews had little or no part. As long as the occupations in which the Jews were engaged were considered unimportant or did not attract members of the majority group the Jews were allowed to live peacefully. When competition arose or when the majority found it necessary to widen its economic basis and could not do so by expansion outside the country, the attempt was made to realize this purpose by action against the Jewish minority. In some instances strained relations were the result of economic conditions within the Jewish group. For whenever the pursuits of members of a minority group are not lucrative, or when the group increases in size, or the status of its trades is lowered because of changed economic conditions, the members of this group leave their positions and make an attempt to find places in new occupations. This process meets with the opposition of the members of the majority group, and economic and social conflicts ensue. Only when the economic opportunities of a country are broadened and new opportunities are opened up for employment is it possible for a minority to enter into new fields. This process, too, is usually not effected without a struggle which reaches beyond the economic field.

In this manner the points of contrast between the Jews and their neighbors come to stand out, either by the attempt to leave established positions and enter new ones or by the desire to limit the "living space" of the Jews and to render their existence difficult. With an abundance of opportunities, opposition and tension diminish; on the other hand it increases greatly when such opportunities begin to decrease.

## I

The economic policies and theories predominant in Europe during the close of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries revolved chiefly around increased production and the development of productive resources. The trend was definitely toward increasing the number of worker-producers. This was done through such methods as the mercantilist colonial policy or by the improvement of the status of the producers or of the forms of production. Increased production called for an expansion of market facilities. Such expansion, however, did not keep pace with the growth of production. A large part of the population of Europe continued to be engaged in agriculture and not very much influenced by the new industrial capitalism. Peasant emancipation in Central Europe, moreover, brought about a decrease in the purchasing power of the peasants due to impoverishment. Mechanical improvements also brought about the displacement of numerous workers. At the same time the countries of Eastern Europe which had served as a market for manufactured goods from Central Europe began to develop their own native industries. These factors brought about repeated economic disturbances and crises.

After the upswing that continued with few interruptions from the time of the French Revolution until after the Napoleonic wars there began, with the cessation of the continental blockade and the flooding of Europe with English goods, a whole series of crises which lasted until 1848. In 1815 a crisis developed in England because of the expansion of the textile industry and a decrease in demand on the continent. During the 'twenties a severe agrarian crisis hit Central Europe and caused a drop in the prices of agricultural products of 40-50 percent. During the 'thirties a financial depression again set in. The disproportion between supply and demand brought in its wake autarkic tendencies and an increase in production in the countries which until this time were chiefly agrarian. The unemployment caused by this development was somewhat mitigated later by the emigration of workers to oversea countries.

Overseas emigration was greatly increased after the Napoleonic wars. In 1818-19 emigration from Europe to America had reached such bounds that the heavily laden boats leaving Europe were afflicted with plagues and a law was passed on March 2, 1819, which limited the number of passengers in each boat and obliged them to stock up with sufficient provisions. During each of the years between 1801-20 the average number

of emigrants sailing from Europe was .08 per thousand inhabitants; during the years 1821-30, .40; and during the years 1841-50, .96. From Germany alone more than 70,000 emigrated to North America between 1818 and 1830, and more than 150,000 during 1830-1840.

New markets for surplus manufactured goods were found in the colonies of the European nations as well as in the backward countries which came under their sway. At the end of the 1840's a new wave of prosperity commenced which, except for a few crises, continued unbroken until 1873. This prosperity was aided in no small degree by the increased gold production resulting from the discoveries of gold mines in California and Australia, by the technological advances in production and by the development of steam engines and the building of railroads. The position of the farmers in Europe was also improved and autarkic tendencies gave way more and more to economic liberalism.

The Jews entered the modern period devoid of civil rights and restricted in their economic activities to positions as middlemen and moneylenders. In Poland they were also engaged in handicraft, in the sale of liquor and to a limited extent in trade. Towards the close of the seventeenth century the Jews began to find it more and more difficult to maintain themselves in these occupations and they began to seek openings in other fields, particularly in trading. Trade had not been explicitly prohibited for Jews and moreover Jewish moneylenders had been permitted to sell unredeemed pawns, which permission could be used as a means of engaging in trade in other used commodities. During the Thirty Years' War another break in the urban anti-Jewish front occurred when Jews were permitted to come to the markets and fairs in the towns from which they had been ejected and carry on trading activities during the limited periods. Out of such provisional grants came first the right to remain for some time after the fair "in order to arrange their business matters" and ultimately permanent Jewish settlements in such places as Leipzig, Breslau, etc.

In Poland the penetration of Jews into commerce and handicrafts was aided by the special position of the towns and cities. As a result of the changes in world economic conditions, the shift of the chief routes of world trade from the East to the West, the dislocation brought about by wars and uprisings and the antagonism between the feudal nobility and the townsmen, the position of the burghers became so bad that they began to leave the towns and their places were taken by Jews. In both

Poland and Western Europe the devastation wrought in the cities, the extermination of many of the inhabitants through wars and plagues all contributed to loosen the hold and efficacy of the old anti-Jewish legislation.

Apart from these factors there were other forces operating to help the Jews enter into trade. There was the need for rehabilitating the localities ruined by wars while at the same time there was no mechanism for the distribution of goods to meet the conditions following the wars. On the other hand there was the sharp opposition between the feudal nobility and the urban bourgeoisie and the desire of the ruling classes to lessen the power of the town merchants. Moreover there grew among the kings and rulers the desire to develop their lands and increase their revenues. All these factors led rulers and princes to welcome the Jews to their courts and to their realms. Moreover, in places laid waste by wars and fires, and in towns abandoned by their inhabitants where the roads were deserted or unusable, there was no place for the regular type of city merchant of that time, who waits for customers to come to his store to buy his wares at fixed prices or for farmers to come into town and sell him their produce also at fixed prices. The Jew, living in the village or else travelling from village to village, was in a better position to buy up the products from the peasants and to sell to them in turn the goods which they needed. In this the Jews were aided by the fact that the inhabitants of the villages—nobles as well as peasants—were dissatisfied with the monopolistic hold which the town merchants exercised and they were anxious to break their political and economic power.

In this manner the Jews were able to occupy positions in trade—in Poland also in handicraft—and gradually they were able to pursue these activities publicly. At first they were forbidden to open shops and they had to deliver the wares to the homes of the purchasers. In competing with the non-Jewish traders or artisans the Jews were forced to resort to such practises as lowering prices, extending credit and barter. The non-Jewish merchants and artisans relied on their privileges and on the regulations of the towns and were unwilling or unable to deviate from their established business practises and regulations. The townsmen sought to protect themselves against the infiltration of Jews into urban occupations by their own town enactments and by demanding of the rulers to close the city gates to the Jews. At times too they attacked them physically. Two tendencies are evident in the attitude of the non-Jews toward the

Jews: on the one hand they sought to prevent them from entering into the city occupations and, on the other, they desired to turn the Jews into "productive" workers.

During the period of mercantilism only those few Jews were treated favorably who were able to contribute to the increase in exports or to the building of factories. All the other Jews, who were likely to be a source of competition to the non-Jews, were regarded as unproductive. Attempts were made to reduce their numbers either by expulsion or by prohibiting them from settling in the cities. Such was the prevalent attitude in Germany. In Russia a "pale of settlement" was set up, after the partition of Poland, the purpose of which was to protect the tradesmen of Moscow and the cities of the interior from the competition of the Jews. On the other hand, the Physiocrats and the promoters of industrialization desired to turn the Jews into farmers and factory workers—to make them "productive"—and thereby to free the townsmen from the competition of the Jews.

The French Revolution ushered in an era in which the old regulations came to be discarded and the ideals of freedom and economic opportunity were diffused throughout Europe. Many restrictions on Jewish activities were discarded and the Jews were able to occupy important economic positions in the cities. This was followed, however, by the period of reaction, with ensuing economic dislocation of agriculture and of the small towns dependent on the surrounding agrarian population. In Germany most of the towns were dependent on the surrounding country for trade. At the beginning of the nineteenth century there were only two large cities in Germany, Berlin and Hamburg, with a population of over 100,000, and these, too, did not remain immune from the crisis. In Poland conditions were not much different. Thus, as is usual in times of crises, autarkic tendencies began to develop together with opposition to strangers and foreign goods, and hostility to "aliens" residing within the country.

In Germany, antisemitism became an integral part of the Romantic movement with its emphasis on the "German spirit" and national unity. With this came an idealization of the past and a glorification of the Middle Ages with their feudal political and social institutions. It was against such a background that the concept of the Christian state developed, which tended to bar the way to all those who were not members of the Christian faith, chiefly the Jews, and to restore them to the status

they occupied in the Middle Ages. The non-Jewish middle class saw in this movement a means of combating its Jewish competitors and of re-establishing its monopolistic control of urban life. In Poland, too, restrictive measures against the Jews were passed and plans were even broached for their expulsion and concentration in one place (somewhat akin to Hitler's "reservation" plan).

After a few decades, however, the European powers were successful in acquiring markets for their goods outside their borders, and the surplus populations began to be absorbed by countries overseas. This made also for the expansion of the domestic market. Industrial capitalism was able to overcome all obstacles and increase the volume of business, so that there was no longer any place for the regulation of urban industries or for jealousy of the Jews and fear of their competition. The tendency toward free trade in foreign markets was accompanied by a trend towards economic liberalism in the domestic market as well.

## II

During the nineteenth century the industrial revolution spread from England to the countries on the European continent and then to America. This development resulted in a changed attitude toward production and distribution. While in the earlier period the chief emphasis had been placed on the factor of production, now more and more attention had to be given to the problem of distribution. This does not mean of course that production declined. On the contrary, the removal of restrictions on industry and trade and increased technological improvements served to intensify productivity in both industry and agriculture. But increased specialization, division of labor, the increase in the number of workers producing only one product or part of a product, the change from production for consumption to production for profits, all these factors brought with them increased needs for the expansion of facilities for distribution. The vast industrial enterprises which were organized required new agencies for the marketing and distribution of their products. The development of commerce called into being a large new class of employes such as bank officials, supervisors, white collar workers, transportation workers and the like. The number and importance of transient city workers increased greatly. With this development came an increase in the national income of the various European countries. Thus the national income of England increased from 92½ million pounds in 1800

to 1,700 millions in 1900; that of France increased from 4,655 million francs in 1790 to 25,000 millions in 1890; that of Germany increased from 15 billion marks in 1885 to 25 billions in 1895. The increase in national income of the countries in Western Europe during this period came not from agriculture but from this expansion of trade, industry and banking. The classes affected most by the rise in income, therefore, were not those engaged in agriculture but rather those in the urban occupations of commerce and industry. This fact was one of the chief reasons for the great shift in population from the villages to the towns and cities. In this respect, too, England exceeded the other countries, while France was backward and in Germany rapid transitions ensued.

Out of every hundred people there lived in the cities:

Country	1800	1850	1880	1900	1910	1925	1933
England .....	7.0	19.2	26.2		35.5	40.0	
Germany .....	1.0	2.8	8.0	16.2	21.2	26.8	30.2
France .....	2.7	4.4	10.0	?	14.5		
Italy .....	5.5	6.3	8.4		11.7		
Austria-Hungary .....	0.9	2.3	5.0		8.5		
Russia .....	1.6	2.0	3.6		6.0		

At the beginning of the nineteenth century Germany had only two large cities; in 1871 it had eight, in 1900 thirty-three and in 1933 fifty-one. In Eastern Europe, where industrialization came later, the movement from country to city also came later. The process of urbanization was hastened during the twentieth century, particularly during the two decades following the first World War. In Poland 80 percent of the population was rural until the close of the nineteenth century; in 1921 it was 75 percent and in 1931, 73 percent.<sup>1</sup>

These two factors, the migration from village to city and the increased importance of urban occupations in the national economy,

<sup>1</sup> These data are derived from the official publications of the Russian census of 1897, the Polish censuses of 1921 and 1931, the *Rocznik Statystyczny*, and the censuses taken in Germany. Sources of some specific facts and figures are: Segall, J., *Die berufliche und soziale Verhältnisse der Juden in Deutschland* (Berlin 1912); Silbergleit, H., *Die Bevölkerung und Berufsverhältnisse der Juden im deutschen Reich. Freistaat Preussen* (Berlin 1930); *Die Glaubensjuden im deutschen Reich. Berufs- und Betriebszählung vom 16. June 1933. Statistik des Deutschen Reiches* Band 451, 5 (Berlin 1936); Weinryb, B., *Der Kampf um die Berufsumschichtung. Ein Ausschnitt aus der Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland* (Berlin 1936); Weinryb, B., *Neueste Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Juden in Russland und Polen* (Breslau 1934).

definitely determined the position of the Jews in nineteenth and early twentieth-century Europe and shaped the character of the entire Jewish problem in Europe. The Jews, by virtue of the economic positions and experience which they had gained, were able to be easily absorbed into the new urban economy. No longer did the non-Jewish townsmen shut the town gates in the face of the Jews in fear of their competition. Economic opportunity increased as did the demands for personnel in the new functions and enterprises. The Jews, as a group not firmly rooted in the soil, were the first to participate in the population shifts within the nations, as well as in overseas emigration. Jews are found among the first immigrants into America from Central and Eastern Europe. In some instances they were the very first to emigrate. The proportion of Jewish emigrants came to exceed their proportion of the general population. Thus, for example, the Jews constituted 40.7 percent of the emigrants from Russia during the years 1889-1914. Whereas the percentage of Jews in independent Poland was only about 10 percent they constituted about 30 percent of the emigrants during the years 1925-1939. In Rumania the Jews constituted between 4 and 5 percent of the total population, yet their numbers among the emigrants during the period 1926-33 reached 25 percent.

The same trend was observable in the shift of population within a country from rural to urban centers. Jews streamed from the villages and small towns to the larger cities. This process was most clearly revealed in the population shifts in Germany, after the rapid advance of industrialization and the lifting of legal restrictions upon Jewish settlement in the cities. The following table indicates the growth of the Jewish population in some of the important cities in Central Europe.

City	1825	1850	1880	1900	1925
Berlin .....	4,079	9,595	53,916	106,000	172,672
Frankfurt-am-Main .....	4,530 <sup>1</sup>	10,000	13,856	21,874	23,385
Breslau .....	4,409	7,384	17,453	19,743	23,240
Hamburg .....	7,000 <sup>2</sup>	10,000	16,024	17,949	18,669
Cologne .....	132 <sup>3</sup>	1,236	3,172	9,745	16,093
Leipzig .....	140 <sup>4</sup>	320	3,179	6,171	12,594
Munich .....	825 <sup>5</sup>	1,208	4,144	8,739	10,068
Vienna .....	1,000	2,000	73,271	146,926	201,513 <sup>6</sup>

1) 1823

2) 1814

3) 1808

4) 1832

5) 1850

6) 1928



The rate of urbanization among Jews, moreover, was much more rapid than among the non-Jews. In 1900 the larger cities of Germany contained 48.45 percent of the German Jews and 16.2 percent of the non-Jews; in 1925 the percentages were 66.8 for Jews and 26.8 for non-Jews; in 1933 they were 70.9 for Jews and 30.2 for non-Jews.

The social and economic structure of the Jewish community in Germany came to resemble more and more that of the general urban population. We can take the Jews of Prussia as an illustration of this point. In 1925 three-fourths of all the Jews of Prussia lived in 32 cities with a population of 100,000 or over. It is therefore permissible to consider the Jewish population of Prussia as predominantly urban and compare its make-up with that of the non-Jewish population in these cities.

Occupation	Prussian Jews in percent	Non-Jews in 32 cities in percent
(1) Trade, credit, transportation .....	58.79	28.90
(2) Industry, handicraft, domestic service .....	29.18	59.58
(3) Agriculture .....	1.74	1.25
(4) Professions, public and private services .....	10.29	10.27

From the above table it will be seen that as far as the third and fourth groups are concerned there was practically no difference between the Jews and non-Jews. In the first and second groups, however, there was a great difference between the Jewish and non-Jewish population. We are presented with an interesting phenomenon. In the first group the relative number of Jews represented is almost double that of the non-Jews while the reverse of this is true in the second group. We can discover the reasons for this difference if we examine the composition of these occupational groups in greater detail and if we look into the sources of the urban population. The city population was derived largely from small villages and towns. The Jews who migrated to the cities had been engaged chiefly in trade, moneylending and related fields. Only a small number of them had been engaged in handicraft. When they came to the cities they continued, for the most part, in the same vocations. On the other hand the non-Jews who came to the cities were mostly farmers or the sons of farmers and it was they who became the industrial workers.

The same process is to be observed in the other countries of Central and Eastern Europe, except for the fact that there industrialization and urbanization came later and at a slower pace. At the beginning of the nineteenth century about one-third of the Jewish population in Poland and the Ukraine lived in rural areas. In 1897, 13.5 percent of the Jews in Poland lived in rural districts and in 1921, 7.3 percent; in the Ukraine it was 8.6 percent. The percentage of Jews in the small towns also declined: in 1897 the Jewish population in towns of 10,000 inhabitants or less in Poland amounted to 44.5 percent and in 1921 it fell to 38 percent. At the same time the percentage of Jews residing in the cities rose from 19.8 percent in 1897 to 26.9 percent in 1921. Similar developments took place in Hungary. The Jews in Budapest, for example, increased from 44,890 in 1869 to 104,290 in 1890, to 203,687 in 1910 and to 215,512 in 1920.

The migration to the cities was accompanied by an economic upswing. The growth and development of city trades made it possible for the Jews to become absorbed in the economy of the country and to occupy important positions. Those few who had been previously engaged in business were able to establish larger firms and their places in turn were occupied by others lower in rank. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the Jews of Germany were engaged in relatively unimportant economic activities. Between 80 and 90 percent were small storekeepers, peddlers and the like. Towards the middle of the century their economic importance began to increase. With the removal of legal and social barriers they began to leave the occupations of peddling and petty trading, positions in the economic ladder which are occupied by those who are not as yet absorbed in trade. The change in their economic importance can be seen from the fact that whereas in 1861, 11.27 out of every hundred Jews in Prussia engaged in trade were peddlers, the percentage in 1925 was only 1.61. Even this small percentage consisted chiefly of immigrants from Eastern European countries, who had not as yet been absorbed into the economy of the country. In 1933, 47.1 percent of all the Jewish peddlers in Germany were from other lands. In Poland, Lithuania and other backward countries, the Jews occupied both the highest and the lowest rungs in the economic scale of city occupations.

The Jews, however, were not the only ones who underwent the process of urbanization. They can perhaps be viewed as pioneers of this

trend, but together with them there streamed into the cities large groups of non-Jews. In the Germany of 1871 about one-third of the population resided in cities and towns and two-thirds in the villages. By 1933 the ratio was reversed: two-thirds of the population resided in the cities and one-third in villages. Also in Poland and other East-European countries we see a stream moving from the country into the cities and towns. This trend led to the decrease of the ratio of Jews to non-Jews in nearly all Polish cities during the post-war period. Thus the percentage of the Jews in Warsaw decreased from 33.9 percent in 1897 to 30.1 percent in 1931 and from 34.5 percent and 35 percent in Lodz and Lwow, respectively, in 1921 to 33.5 percent and 31.9 percent, respectively, in 1931. Much larger was the decrease in the percentage of the Jews and the increase of the non-Jews in the smaller Polish towns reaching at times 40-50 percent.

The elements, who came from the country, turned at first to work in the factories, domestic service and lower forms of business. Gradually, however, they attempted to enter into more important positions. In Central Europe they occupied the places that were left open by Jews who reached higher economic levels. In pre-Hitler Germany the majority of small businesses, such as storekeeping, the sale of milk and vegetables and peddling, were in the hands of non-Jews. The percentage of peddlers was also greater among the non-Jews who engaged in trade than among the Jews. In 1852 there were to be found among every 100 peddlers in Prussia 77.5 non-Jews and 22.5 Jews. In 1895 there were 91.24 non-Jews and 8.76 Jews and in 1925 there were 95.35 non-Jews and 4.65 Jews. In absolute figures the number of Jewish peddlers diminished from 2,165 in 1895 to 1,796 in 1925, while the general number of peddlers in Prussia rose from 24,679 to 38,722. In other more important branches of trade the relative number of Jews also diminished because of the increased number of non-Jews engaging in them. But here, too, the main decrease was to be seen in the lower levels of the occupations. In 1925 there were 3.84 percent Jews among those engaged in banking and credit in Prussia, and 17.95 percent among the owners and directors of banks; in Berlin the percentage of the Jews engaged in banking and credit was 6.23 and of those heading and directing banks 32.68. In general commerce the percentage of Jews was 6.28, but the percentage of owners was 10.74 and of directors 12.58. The status of the non-Jews who entered the city occupations greatly resembled that of the Jews of two and three decades pre-

viously. After succeeding in entering the lower levels they endeavored, as had the Jews before them, to rise higher and higher.

In their struggle to reach the higher economic positions the newer non-Jewish elements came into conflict with the Jews, who were already occupying these positions. This non-Jewish middle class came to view the Jews as their chief enemies who had grabbed the positions which they themselves coveted. In this respect there was no difference to be seen between independent manufacturers, tradesmen and bankers and between employes in industry and banking and academic workers or those engaged in any other urban occupation. Everywhere the newcomers found that the Jews had preceded them. In the Eastern European countries the field of petty trading became the area of conflict between the non-Jews and the Jews since these lower positions were still occupied by the Jews. In years of prosperity this conflict was not in evidence but in years of crisis, when the possibilities for economic gain were limited, the struggle for these positions assumed a sharp form.

During the 'seventies of the last century, after the unification of Germany, the period of economic liberalism came practically to an end. Various countries adopted a protective tariff against foreign goods and attempted to clear their markets of foreign products. There also began a struggle against "foreigners" within the countries. A strong antisemitic movement developed at this time in practically all the European countries and especially in Germany. In Poland and Lithuania many members of the nobility as well as their employes entered city occupations after they had lost their property and positions in the uprising of 1863. They opened shops or became employes in stores. At the same time the impoverishment of the peasants, which was brought on by the conditions of their emancipation and their heavy debt burden as well as by the agricultural depression and the fall in prices of their products during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, drew many of them to the cities where they became competitors of the Jews in industry and petty trade.

During this period there developed in Germany the race theories, which came to occupy the place of the "Christianity" of Romanticism. Instead of the exclusiveness of the "Christian state," advocated by the Romantics, there developed the theory of exclusiveness of the racial state. The former had created an ideological basis for the prevention of Jews from entering into the various economic positions, the latter

aimed to deprive them of the positions which they were able to occupy in the interim. At the same time the idea of the corporate state was revived with its ideals of a regulated and ordered society in which, of course, there would be no room for the Jewish minority. In Poland, the Polish nationalists, after the 1863 uprising, sought to strengthen their economic positions in order to further their political aspirations and they viewed the Jews increasingly as "aliens" and as agents of Russification.

The height of this economic conflict was reached in the years after the conclusion of the first World War. The stream of migration from country to city was intensified and the lower fields of urban occupations were now filled with second and third-generation descendants of peasants and farmers. During the years of economic prosperity which followed the period of inflation in Germany the conflict between Jew and non-Jew was softened, but with the advent of economic decline it again came to the fore. Many of the newcomers to the cities were now without a livelihood and without prospect of economic advance. In addition the number of people engaged in business was augmented by the crisis. Employes who were discharged from their jobs and unemployed workers began to engage in petty trading. During the years 1929-33 market tradesmen appeared on the corners of the large cities of Germany and their numbers show that the percentage of such "independent" tradesmen grew from 15.9 to 16.4 percent.

In the countries which were formed in Eastern Europe after the first World War definite attempts were made by the state to create an urban class, a commercial class, a professional class and the like. The nobility, impoverished by the war, and the peasants, brought into active political life by the war, now also sought places in the fields of commerce and the professions. The number of Jewish students in the universities during the years immediately following the World War corresponded to the proportion of Jews in the cities. With the entrance of the country people into the city occupations, however, the proportion of Jewish students began to diminish until it approximated the percentage of Jews in the entire population. In the case of Poland it diminished to an even greater extent. The number of Jewish students in Poland decreased during 1922-35 by 3,000, whereas the number of non-Jewish students rose by 12,000; the percentage of Jewish students was 24.6 percent in 1922 and 13.0 percent in 1935. In Hungary the percentage declined from 31.7

percent in 1917-18 to 12.5 percent in 1933; in Latvia from 15.7 percent in 1921 to 7.1 percent in 1935-36; in Kaunas from 27.1 percent in 1926 to 16.4 percent in 1935.

The relative decline of Jewish participation in urban economic activity is shown in percentage in the accompanying table. In Budapest the number of Jews engaged in business decreased from 62.2 percent in 1900 to 50.6 percent in 1920 and 40.0 percent in 1935; in Lodz from 67.8 percent in 1897 to 61.6 percent in 1921 and 51.0 percent in 1935; in Warsaw from 79.3 percent in 1882 to 62.1 percent in 1897, 60.0 percent in 1921, 54.0 percent in 1926, 51.4 percent in 1931 and 48.0 percent in 1935.

#### DISTRIBUTION OF EUROPEAN JEWRY BY SELECTED OCCUPATIONS

In Percent

		Business and banking	Communications	Public and private services and professions
Congress Poland	1897	75.4	22.8	19.9
	1921	66.8	15.4	14.9
	1935	58.0		
Galicia	1910	83.4	14.9	17.4
	1921	74.1	8.5	13.3
Lithuania	1897	85.7		
	1923	73.1		
	1935	55.0		
Latvia	1897	45.4		
	1925	41.4		
	1935	32.0		
Hungary	1910	46.6	5.9	11.0
	1921	40.0	5.7	10.5
	1935	30.0		

Before 1914 Poland was a typical country of emigration; about 150,000 people used to leave it annually in addition to the yearly temporary migrations in search of agricultural work. This emigration ceased with the passage of restrictive immigration laws in the immigration countries and the banning of outside agricultural workers from Germany. At the same time the natural increase in population reached almost half a million per year. As a predominantly agricultural country Poland was also hard hit by the agricultural crisis and by the scarcity of land for the

peasants. All these factors increased the stream of migrants from country to city and to city pursuits. Since industry could not absorb new workers because of the depression the newcomers together with the unemployed attempted to force their way into petty trades and handicrafts.

An additional factor in this situation was provided by the fact that as the importance of the urban economic activities increased the state came to feel that the agencies for distribution and marketing should be kept in the control of the majority nationality. Due to all these causes the pressure upon urban occupations was greatly increased and as a result the opposition to the Jews intensified. The differences between Central and Eastern Europe are only those of degree of intensity, deriving from the difference in rate of industrialization. In Germany, where the Jews represented only a small percentage of the urban population, they were able to occupy most favorable economic positions. In all the cities, however, there were also non-Jewish elements coveting these positions and anxious to remove the Jews from them. In Eastern Europe the Jews made up more than one-third of the urban population and in their hands was concentrated from 60 to 75 percent of the commerce and from 40 to 50 percent of industry and handicrafts. In these fields they occupied the lower as well as the highest positions. The non-Jews newly arriving from the villages and as yet not qualified to take over the more important positions vied with the Jews for the lower places. The process, therefore, was a more gradual one. Whereas in Germany we had the forceful ejection of the Jews from their economic positions, the countries in Eastern Europe (before the second World War) set up restrictions and obstacles, such as the citizenship laws in Rumania or the *numerus clausus* in Hungary, and aid was extended to the non-Jews through credits, government agencies and often forceful subjugation of the Jews.

In the countries of Western Europe, where the Jews were few in number, the process of urbanization had either been completed some time before, as in England, or was slowly going on, as in France. There was no great influx of population from the country and the tendency toward autarky could not take form because of the relationships with the colonies. The conflict between Jew and non-Jew therefore did not come to the fore. In Central and Eastern Europe, however, the very development of capitalism, which presented the Jews with the opportunity to enter into various city pursuits and to occupy important economic positions, prepared the way for new classes of non-Jews who wanted to

displace the Jews. This pressure on the part of the new groups upon the Jews provides the background for the intensification of antisemitism in the years preceding the second World War and its augmentation in Nazism and in the Nazi-dominated and influenced countries.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup>The material from the war years and the Nazi occupation is not yet sufficient for us to be able to come to definite conclusions about the measure of response to the Nazi anti-Jewish propaganda in the occupied countries. We may, however, gain a general idea of the situation. In France and the Netherlands the non-Jewish population generally helped the Jews and was opposed to the Nazi anti-Jewish measures. The resistance movement in these countries was pro-Jewish. The reverse was true in the East-European countries (Poland, Lithuania, Latvia). The peoples of these countries mostly accepted the Nazi attitude toward Jews and in many cases even helped in its materialization. The resistance movement in these countries supported Jews to a slight extent only, and in some cases such as the "Armja Krajowa" in Poland, was antisemitic. In the concentration camps and elsewhere Poles, Lithuanians and Ukrainians frequently assisted the Nazis in exterminating Jews, and their cruelty was not always surpassed by that of the Germans. As far as one can judge at present, the differences between Eastern and Western Europe continued to condition the fate of the Jews throughout the years of Nazi domination.



## SOME REMARKS ON THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ANTISEMITISM

By I. S. WECHSLER

The title of this paper is somewhat of a misnomer. Actually it is incorrect to speak of the psychology of an idea or of a sentiment without regard to the mental or psychological make-up of the person who holds it. Hence it would be more accurate to speak of the psychology of the anti-semite as an active agent and of the psychology of the Jew as the object of antisemitism. It is true that in order to understand the reactions of an individual or a group to a given phenomenon one must inquire into its nature, but for purposes of psychologic investigation a study of the first is the more important of the two. The validity of this view becomes increasingly apparent as we come to realize that the nature of antisemitism often defies understanding, that many of the so-called reasons for its existence actually are no reasons at all, and that the violence of the hostile personal reactions is altogether out of proportion to the external factors which are said to give rise to them.

In an article published in the *Menorah Journal* in 1925,<sup>1</sup> I reached the conclusion that antisemitism presents an emotional and not an intellectual problem and that in essence it is both an individual and a group neurosis. Here is a phenomenon which not only has eluded reason and logic but has defied time, place and persons, and has successfully resisted almost every attempt to cope with it. And so the question has arisen whether either the Jew or the Christian, despite assertions to the contrary, is actually willing and able to meet or understand it. More important than the validity or lack of validity of the alleged causes of antisemitism is the fact that its outbursts have generally served as vicarious outlets for the Christian. But evident as this may appear, it is perhaps no less true to say that antisemitism often serves as an evasion of unpleasant reality and, although it may sound paradoxical, that the Jew too has evaded the ultimate implications of the problems. It may even be admitted that many a Jew, who has what is not incorrectly called the pogrom mentality, is

<sup>1</sup> "The Psychology of Anti-Semitism," in *Menorah Journal*, vol. xi (1925) 159-66.

not altogether averse to an occasional outbreak of antisemitism provided it is not too violent or of long duration.

Although attention has previously been called to this, it may be worth re-emphasizing that there are several types of antisemitism or several conceptions underlying it. One form has its core in the aversion to the Jewish religion. This and not the Jew is regarded with disfavor. He is discriminated against merely as the carrier or the embodiment of a religion which is offensive to the majority. In this scheme there is nothing wrong with the Jew; indeed he would be welcomed as an equal, provided he would discard his religion. That he must tear out deep roots, forswear his people, destroy his culture and do violence to his emotions in the process are facts of minor importance. It may be well to point out, however, that although the religion and not the Jew is the object of the hate, it is human beings and not ideas that suffer persecution. Another type of antisemitism is that directed against the Jew as an individual or the Jewish group as an entity. In this scheme his religion is not altogether objectionable and his philosophy of life not quite unacceptable, but his personal or racial characteristics are abhorrent. This is the philosophy of the Jewish religion be praised and the Jew be damned. A third form is that which combines the two views and consistently damns both the Jew and his religion. It may be pointed out, however, that the reactions toward the Jew not only varied according to one or another of those views but differed at various times and places and depended upon a great many factors which entered into the situation of the moment. In the main, and for a long time, the antagonism of the Christians was directed against the Jew who stubbornly refused to embrace Christianity. More recently the antagonism toward him has grown in violence because he wants to be too much like his Christian neighbor.

Perhaps the most outstanding characteristic of antisemitism is that it has persisted for a great many centuries and that, except for changing manifestations, is almost as virulent today as it ever was. Indeed it threatens to persist for a long time to come unless the cultural and economic structure of society should undergo some radical change. While it is true that mass antagonism to the Jew existed in the pre-Christian Alexandrian and the early Roman Christian eras,<sup>2</sup> the phenomenon as we know it today essentially grew up after the Christian religion became more or less dominant in Europe. Actually antisemitism did not take on the dignity of a

<sup>2</sup> See the essay by Ralph Marcus below, p. 61-78.

philosophy of life until the Germans, with their fatal capacity to coin words and systematize error, perforce tried to rear ideologies which had no foundation in reason or nature. The fact is, however, that violent eruptions began about the eighth and ninth centuries, increased in frequency and intensity with the crusades, and have punctuated history down to date. That persecution of the Jew also occurred in the Islamic world is true, but that was more or less purely religious persecution. It never reached among the Moslems the dignity of a system of thought and never became a social aim.<sup>3</sup>

Intensely characteristic of antisemitism is its deep emotional hold on the Christian and its fairly general defiance of logic. The attempt has been made to explain antisemitism on a religious basis, on economic grounds, on physical, racial or ethnological differences, on the idea based on the general antagonism to strangers and foreigners, on manners and culture, on the difference in the psychology of the Jew and the peoples among whom he lived, and on a host of other factors. It may readily be admitted that there is much to be said for each of these views. But it becomes clear even on superficial analysis that many of the reasons given are no reasons at all and many of the proffered explanations at best merely touch the surface of the problem. What is generally true is that, with honorable exceptions, most Christians have at one time or another felt and expressed either publicly or in private their emotional antagonism. And this applies equally to the gentleman and the knave, the illiterate and the scholar, the cultured and the boor, the rich man and the poor, the wise man and the fool. To add to the perplexity, all sorts of contradictory reasons are generally advanced. The Jew is a rebel and a patriot, an anarchist and socialist, a mongrel and racially pure, an exploiter and a dispossessed beggar, a coward and heroic martyr, and so on down the gamut of opposing human sentiments.

The Jew is accused of assimilating too well or of persisting in being himself, and however much he may try to fit into the scheme of things he is still regarded as indigestible and unassimilable. The upshot is that recurrent attempts were made to put him in his place or make him harmless; this in practise meant persecution or destruction. On all occasions the Christian world kept on telling the Jew, to use a colloquialism, that he cannot take it on the chin, wherefore they have persisted in hitting below the belt. To anticipate and to meet such attacks the Jew was com-

<sup>3</sup>See the essay by Samuel Rosenblatt below, p. 112-20.

pelled to devise methods of self-defense which, to be successful, had to be devious. He was compelled to have recourse to subterfuge and to protective coloration. The importance of this observation lies in this, that what are regarded as natural characteristics of behavior in the Jew are merely behavior patterns secondarily elaborated in the process of survival. The attack being brutal and unfair, the defense had to be canny and could not be overscrupulous. Pertinent to this is the Jew's insistence on the fiction of the chosen people. What began as an infantile delusion lingered on to become a powerful inner defense against assault from without. That the Jew was frequently chosen to be the butt of sadistic impulses merely goes to show how a harmless delusion can be turned into a horrible and grim joke. What is of interest is that the Jew, who is supposed to have a good sense of humor, has not yet learned to see the point.

It may be admitted that by his persistence in remaining himself, the Jew has to a large extent contributed to the perpetuation of antisemitism. He acted on occasion in the capacity of a lightning-rod and generally served the human need for a scapegoat. The phenomenon of antisemitism becomes understandable as we realize that culture and civilization are but thin veneers and that the human animal is still considerably blind and emotional in his behavior. Human nature being what it is and primitive impulses being what they are, the Jew has acted as an irritant. His adult sense of realism, for instance, jars infantile phantasy, and his insistence on peace and social ethics makes of him a nuisance to those who feel that war is a noble aim in life. Rigorous logic and realistic thinking can be very unpleasant, whereas muddled and superficial thinking is so much easier.

The occasional exhibition of tolerance toward the Jew, while it naturally called forth gratitude or at least gave rise to a sense of relief, actually served to irritate him. Tolerance implies a sense of superiority on the part of him who shows it. To this the Jew reacted either with a feeling of superiority of his own or a feeling of defeat which nursed a sense of inferiority. This engendered both a feeling of revolt and frustration and led to a sulking withdrawal into himself. So, too, the modern violent emphasis upon nationalism, chauvinism, standardization, and the reduction of all society to the level of a low common denominator arouse the very opposite type of reaction in the Jew. Thus the unhealthy attitude of the Christian toward the Jew engenders an equally unhealthy attitude in the Jew toward the Christian. The fact that Christian religion has regarded

the Jew as a challenge and his survival as an offense merely served to bring forth persistence and stubborn acts of defiance.

It is becoming increasingly evident that the illogical aspects of anti-semitism, its blind fury, the futility of any defense which the Jew can put up, the contradictory and almost neurotic reactions which characterize it, make a rational solution almost hopeless. It is quite possible that a change in the economic order and the bridling of religious forces or the removal of the emphasis upon intense nationalism may weaken and ultimately eliminate antisemitism. Considering that progress in human culture is not rapid and change in social structure slow, the probability is great that the same psychological factors will continue to operate. This may be a pessimistic view but it unfortunately fits the existing situation.

The conclusion seems to be justified that up to and including the present the Christian world has shown neither the ability nor the inclination to solve the problem of antisemitism; and it must be admitted that the Jew, too, has consistently refused to solve it. The only condition on which it can be eliminated, the Jew is neither willing nor able to meet. For antisemitism to disappear the Jew must cease to be; but this is precisely what he cannot do and the price he is unwilling to pay. Even allowing for the temporary aberration which forbids the Jew to assimilate, the attempt at assimilation is not always effective, and is not quite novel besides. As a matter of fact it has been tried before and it has failed. It has failed because it represented an unsatisfactory and not altogether honest compromise, and the world does not long tolerate dishonest compromises. The Reform Jew attempted it with inconspicuous success. Actually the Jew tried to adapt himself without changing. He would be a Jew and non-Jew at the same time. He literally tried to eat the cake and to have it, and it simply cannot be done. To remain a Jew in the Christian world one must pay a price, and that price unfortunately is antisemitism. No ostrich attitude can do away with the fact. The orthodox Jew made his adjustment in a better and intellectually more honest way. He built a fence not only around the Torah but around himself as well, and he let the storms rage outside. This gave him an inner security which the modernized or half-assimilated Jew does not possess. It remains to be seen what Zionism will do. There are those who feel that it is the ultimate answer to the age-old problem; others feel that at best it is but a partial one.

It is evident, therefore, that antisemitism is not simply a Jewish problem or a problem for the Jew alone. It affects the Christian no less

than the Jew and warps the judgment of the one as much as of the other. If it be regarded as a disease it is no less a Christian than a Jewish disease; in fact more Christian than Jewish, though the Jew suffers most. It is an atavistic malady, a reversion to primitive, emotional ways of thinking and acting. And yet, paradoxical as it may sound, intelligence alone will ultimately be able to remedy it, the type of intelligence which squares with emotions at the same time that it bridles them. That type is of exceedingly slow growth. As long as blind emotions will continue to motivate human conduct, antisemitism will not perceptibly diminish.

## ANTISEMITISM AND OURSELVES

By Z. DIESENDRUCK

Antisemitism in both its active and its passive forms is a reality easily perceived and easily described; in its active form as antagonism and aggression and in its passive form as the effects of this aggression upon those against whom it is directed, the Jews. Yet those two forms, clear and inclusive as they may appear, do not seem to exhaust the entire phenomenon. There is one strip in this vast field which seems to lie beyond these observable realities or perhaps as a border strip between the active and passive parts. It is that area where active antisemitism ceases to be the seemingly easily explainable opposition to the Jew for definite reasons and where, on the other hand, the passive part consists of more than of bad effects caused by external forces, but where our reaction becomes an integral part of ourselves, an apparently spontaneous state of mind. The nature of this phase, in both parts, is of course to a great extent a psychological one. Yet it is more than this, because the available psychological categories, taken from other similar phenomena, do not suffice to explain it satisfactorily. It is the phase where antisemitism appears to us as a type of antagonism hardly comparable to any other case of this kind and again the effect of it in ourselves does not find its equal among the various psychological reactions of hated or persecuted individuals or groups. It is that phase which reveals to us the uniqueness of the phenomenon of antisemitism and the uniqueness of our reaction. Our approach may perhaps be called a phenomenological rather than a psychological one.

The very attempt to detect, if possible, the causes of antisemitism and perhaps also to find ways and means of removing them, this very attempt of ours shows that it is still necessary to point out the unique character of the entire phenomenon and that the recognition of this uniqueness may also lead to a different attitude on our part. We open the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, a volume published in the good old days of the "Jewish Republic" in Germany, and we find an article on antisemitism extending over 150 columns. One long continuous story—beginning with the book of Esther or with the more historical riots against the Jews on the island of Elephantine in 410 B.C.E. up to our own days—the scenes of which were spread all over the world, wherever was present the suitable object, the Jew. The literature on both sides, beginning with the early Hel-

lenistic period, is tremendous. Does not this merely quantitative feature, or in fact the very name, place antisemitism in a class by itself? There have been many nations which have been objects of antagonism; there have been religious, social and political movements with opposition to them, yet there has never been coined a standing term for the merely negative attitude. There is no name and no article in any encyclopedia in the world for anti-British or anti-Italian movements, nor for anti-socialism or anti-liberalism, etc. Was not in our case the term required in order to comprise all those various conflicting antagonisms, to comprise them so that they lose their particular and negative character and become an all-inclusive and essentially positive concept although with negative tendency? Consequently the term philosemitism does not denote the positive attitude of *love* to the Jews but rather only a negative attitude towards antisemitism, or as Max Mueller called it anti-antisemitism.

The uniqueness of the problem commences with this very name, with the hyphenless antisemitism. But the name is a result of the necessity to give a common denominator to a variety of sometimes even contradictory rationalizations. Within the same twelfth century we were persecuted by the Almohads for not believing in the unity of God and by the Crusaders for not believing in the Trinity. We are accused of extreme materialism by Luther ("Die Juden beten zur Erde"), by Renan, and recently also by one of the National-Socialist philosophers, Wilhelm Stapel, since Judaism preaches peace on *earth*; and again of too much abstractness and imagination by Tacitus and by Dühring ("Der Jude ist in Bildern und Träumen befangen, hat keinen Sinn für's Wirkliche"). We are blamed for being communists and also for being international bankers. We are accused of backwardness and reactionism and at the same time for being the instigators of all radical revolutions. We are blamed for our stubborn separatism and at the same time for our ease of assimilation, for joining the ruling nation, and again for our innate internationalism. We are regarded as unproductive and mere mediators and transmitters of values created by others and yet we are the ones who poison the *roots* of other cultures. The list of these contradictions from all angles can be increased indefinitely.

Yet these evident contradictions should not fill us with satisfaction and confidence as to the ease of their refutation or disuasion. On the contrary, those conflicting rationalizations show us how strong and gen-



uine that thing is which stands behind the alleged reasons so as to remove all logical scruples in producing them. It indicates that the decisive factor here is something primeval and irrational and that the rationalization is either an alibi for others or an excuse for oneself. We often hear it said: antisemites certainly do not themselves believe in the validity of their contentions but antisemitism has proved to be a good means of diverting the minds of the people in times of crises. It is precisely this, however, which again shows that in a crisis, where there is no rational way out, this irrational factor always can be awakened and used. If we remove all those superimposed post-factum rationalizations, antisemitism proves to be one of the rare specimens of *pure hate*; of that irrational, purely emotional negative fixation, which, as its counterpart, is by nature blind.

Thus its purity makes the hate a puzzling yet fascinating phenomenon *sui generis*. It gives it a certain absoluteness and identity through all the ages and through all the guises which it has assumed. We write histories of facts, of problems, of social and spiritual movements—would it not be worth while also to write a history of attitudes? One of the most promising topics for such a history would be a historical monograph on antisemitism, which would divest the identical attitude of its time-conditioned garbs of argumentation and show, furthermore, by this most suitable example, how dexterously the irrational merges and hides itself within all kinds of rationalizations. There is, therefore, no greater self-deception than to speak of causes of antisemitism, or even of ways to remove them; all of the antisemitism we encounter in reality is nothing but a facade for the latent prime cause, which is irreducible.

This is also the reason for the main complaint we have against antisemitism, for its unjust generalization. The irrational in the subconscious reaches out and is happy to get hold of any individual case which may help substantiate its originally general attitude. Here also is the crucial point, where the antisemitic non-Jew, if otherwise just, becomes aware of that inner mutual incompatibility between the irrational motive and its rationalized pretense. This awareness develops frequently into an actual conflict in his attitude towards the individual Jew and the group. The saying by the antisemite that "some of his best friends are Jews" is more than a joke; it expresses the awakening of that conflict and the inability to resolve it.

This conflict, however, appears in a much more intense form in our-

selves. Our indestructible optimism with regard to the possibility of overcoming antisemitism would be ridiculous and a classic example of the inability to learn a lesson from a history of two and one-half thousand years, were it not for the fact, that we ourselves, the directly concerned, suffer most of the conflict between the rational appearance and irrational essence of antisemitism, we suffer *with it*. Again and again we take a run against the rational front only to be smashed by the irrational stone wall behind. This repeated experience has entirely shaken the equilibrium of our judgment in matters of individual and group. And this in two respects, with regard to acts done *to* individuals among us and with regard to acts *by* individuals of our group and their evaluation for the group. When an adverse act is done to one of us, we are never certain in our judgment whether we ought to take it as an individual act on its own merits or see in it an act directed against the group. We frequently make mistakes in both directions. Again, in the evaluation of outstanding good or bad acts on the part of individuals among us, we are oversensitive in the case of a bad individual but even more overly proud of a good one—this despite our continuous protestation against generalizations. Here again we do it not addressing ourselves to the rational part of antisemitism but in fear of or in triumph over that ever felt irrational in it.

This peculiar reaction is quite different from the normal psychological attitude of self-defense or the readiness for it in an attacked individual or group. We plead with the rational against us but we are instinctively aware of the irrational. Hence that self-consciousness which accompanies our actions and undertakings even without an opponent in sight. It is that permanent readiness and watchfulness, becoming even a certain solicitude for that which may happen, which is bound to happen. We reach out not for friends but for advocates, for defenders.

We share of course with all the weak and persecuted the so-called inferiority complex and its necessary corollary, the compensative tendencies. But corresponding to the tenacity and irrationality of the attack, these two tendencies, in their origin psychological, grew into the realm of the religious and the metaphysical. The inferiority developed into a sense of *guilt*, the compensation into the belief in having been *chosen* for a holy function among the nations. The idea of the extreme mutual responsibility between the individual and the community is an original Jewish one and was operative in the very earliest forming of the Jewish view of life. The later ingredient is that element of collective self-

accusation, of the group atoning for the sin of the individual and of interpreting our *fate* as our *guilt*. This constitutes an essential motif in the Jewish prayer book. It was the same with the compensative tendency. We elevated and hypostatized our history of suffering into a destined role imposed upon us, as the servant of the Lord, for the sanctification of His Name. Ours is a definite mission and our suffering is a part of it. The purposive center of our existence was put beyond, outside that existence, put into a remote metaphysical sphere. Here again the irrationality of the action against us was met by the irrationality of our reaction.

A further development of this self-consciousness is the split in the Jewish personality, resulting in that large gamut of self-criticism in which we Jews are incomparable. The underlying principle seems to be the same in the cheap Jewish joke and in the highly developed self-negating philosophy. The principle lies in that very area where we ourselves share somehow in the irrational attitude of antisemitism and are in fact to blame for the same unjust procedures, such as unfounded generalizations, of which we accuse the others.

Our frequent inclination to a captious disapproval of acts or habits of our group is the most common feature of this attitude. These criticisms are, curiously enough, usually not directed against matters or traits in the moral field, where it might be very useful, but against certain esthetic matters, which are matters of taste, not to be examined or disputed. Let us be frank and admit that in these respects our attitude is not any more just than that of our enemies. We are tempted to overstate and generalize perhaps more readily than the decent non-Jew. Yet we do it with less logical consistency. While inclined to designate certain unpleasant mannerisms which we notice in individuals as inherent characteristics of the entire group, we still claim the right for ourselves to be regarded as free from these undesirable characteristics of our own group. Why, then, should we not regard our alleged model behavior as the behavior of our group? One can frequently hear the loud complaints of a Jew, after dinner, of the noisiness of the Jews. Here too belongs that explanation of the hotel-owner who excludes Jews from his hotel because some non-Jews object to them. He contends that he would be perfectly willing to have Jews only, but when the non-Jews do not come the Jews stay away too.

A step further and a chapter in itself is the self-derision so peculiar to Jews. It is revealed in the little joke as well as in the highly developed art of the Eisenbachs in Vienna and of some well-known comedians here

and in other Jewish centers. There are jokes about peculiarities of many national or racial groups, of Irishmen, of negroes, etc. Nowhere, however, can one find such an abundant output of this kind of fun by members of the groups themselves. This should by no means be regarded as censure of the Jewish individuals who participate in such Jewish self-derision. It is but another symptom of the entire mental situation.

All these phenomena culminate in that of conscious self-negation, of the peculiar Jewish cases of self-hatred. This is not always articulate or communicative enough to furnish us with sufficient documentary material. The tragedy of being that which one despises in specie is too great a conflict as to always find or even seek a vent for expression. There are enough cases, however, to serve as representatives for the silent many. There has hardly been an outstanding antisemite who did not have his Jewish followers, mostly just in this point. Schopenhauer had his Frauenstädt and Ascher, Richard Wagner his Heinrich Porges and Herman Levi, and even Dühring found a Jewish writer, Benedikt Friedländer, who made him the beneficiary of a great fortune after committing suicide. Above all there are famous cases of men of great sensitivity and creative genius who were consumed by their tragic conflict. I refer to the convulsive Arthur Trebitsch, fighting desperately against his own being with philosophical and political weapons, to Otto Weininger, in whom that conflict reached the highest metaphysical expression, to Paul Rée, the once close friend of Nietzsche, who in noble taciturnity carried his cross, and a number of others who found no way out other than physical self-destruction. These were not cowards or traitors; they represent rather the highest and most intense type of self-identification with the group. They took the sin of the group, as they saw it, upon themselves and they sought to atone for it as rigidly as they could. It is the prophetic revolt, only in the opposite direction. It was Weininger who in his last writings used most frequently the word crime, but it is true for all of them, that they felt as guilt not our fate, as does our prayer book, but our very being, our *so-being*.

Such is the unique reaction on our part to the unique aggression against us. This reaction can by no means be pigeonholed into the concept of defense-mechanism or the inferiority complex of a persecuted group. Its roots reach into a much deeper layer and, as I wish to point out, essentially into the same layer from which that primeval antagonism of our opponents comes.

This reaction should support us, along with other reasons, in rejecting

those theories about antisemitism, which—although recognizing the predominance of the hate-motif and so being closest to our view—still try to subsume our special case under a larger and more general category. I refer especially to the theory of F. Bernstein, who sees antisemitism entirely as a special case of group antagonism directed against a weak minority. It would lead us too far were we to enumerate here the many essential differences between antisemitism and any other contempt or even persecution of a socially inferior minority. We are more feared for our strength than despised for our weakness. I have also in mind the theory of Constantin Brunner, who in a number of books tries to interpret antisemitism as group-egoism in contradistinction to *Denken*. If there be any particle which our plain meaning of thinking has in common with Brunner's *Denken*, it would be surprising indeed that antisemitism flourished and reached its climax just *im Lande der Denker*, not without the active support of leading thinkers, past and present.

We must, therefore, make the last step and resort to the unique, unsubsumable, and irrational. It may be it was not always so, perhaps time vaporized all which might once have been a material admixture or a logical reason in antisemitism. Today, to us reviewing the past it appears pure, yes even pure of *prejudice*, because it is not based on any judicial premises.

To recognize this true character of antisemitism may be of great advantage to us, even though we cannot propose any means for its cure. The pessimistic result is not entirely negative. Sometimes the recognition of a condition as inevitable and immutable is not of less value for our behavior than the discovery of means to remove it. Our knowledge of the inevitability of death—also only an empirical one without scientific demonstration—has become a corrective, stimulating and enriching part of our life and so more valuable than some futile speculations about an escape. By resigning ourselves to the irrationality and essential incurability of the condition of antisemitism we may succeed in modifying our reaction for the better. We might first abandon the underlying ideologies of organizations like Alliance Israélite, Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus, anti-defamation leagues, with their hope to uproot the evil through persuasion and argument or even through changing our mode of life by a new distribution of occupations, by improving our manners, etc. We might save ourselves the disappointment bound to follow such attempts. Every attempt to fight an irrational phenomenon by rational means, mistaking symptoms for causes, is not only futile but also harmful; it leads

to that clash with the stone wall, the shock of disillusionment, and all the resulting and lasting consequences.

We might also relieve somewhat that tension which results from the dualism in the Jewish soul and which leads to the split attitude and conflict, to the peculiar self-consciousness and also to self-negation. Self-accusation is inverted apologetics, and to the disillusionment of the latter corresponds the tragedy of self-condemnation. Both root ultimately in the experience of the inefficacy of the rational.

There are two places where the correctness of our interpretation of the Jewish reaction may be tested. One is Palestine; there too we are still a minority surrounded by a strongly antagonistic majority; there, too, we have to be ready for defense against severe attacks. But in Palestine there is missing that irrational element; there is a fight for land, for rights, for rational matters—against a rationally understandable opposition. The second place is, paradoxically enough, present-day Germany. This represents one of those involuntary experiments, well known in our history. Antisemitism in Germany has revealed itself in all its nakedness; occasional rationalization is only a joke on foreign correspondents. There also the Jewish reaction is by necessity free of all apologetic illusions. The struggle there, inch by inch, is for ground for bare existence. But in both places, I am sure, Jews mind less their looking Jewish and the mannerisms of other Jews; the self-deriding Jewish comedian is out of work, and the atmosphere is certainly not favorable for the growth of a Maximilian Harden or Karl Kraus or Otto Weininger. The German catastrophe is at least not reflected any more in a tragic conflict within the Jew.

Whenever we are confronted with an ambiguously rationalized, at times even bashful antisemitism, let us courageously penetrate to the truth behind it. In the individual cases of aggression we must of course defend ourselves with all available means, protect our rights and our honor and also our life, socially, economically and spiritually we should improve following the demands of our best wisdom and conscience. But let us give up the apologetic squinting; let us free ourselves from the burden of proof for the right of our existence and also from the burden of finding and removing the causes of that which is itself a prime cause. When called to the last account—it is not we who are the defendants. Let us submit to our fate with reserve and dignity.

And yet: *Utinam interpretes falsus sim!*

## DEFENSES AGAINST ANTISEMITISM

MAIN

By JACOB R. MARCUS

Antisemitism, in its overt form, is the belief that Jews are a pernicious influence in the entire structure of modern life and hence must be effectively removed. This philosophy of Jewish-Christian relations, developed and furthered by antisemites, cannot be disregarded. It made such progress in the defunct Third Reich that German Jewry, the most cultured and advanced Jewry in the world, has been degraded politically, culturally, and socially. National Socialism as an international movement made itself felt in almost every civilized country of the world and the extent of its permeation marks the extent of its threat to all who belong to the Jewish group by virtue of the circumstances of their birth. The universal result of antisemitism is twofold. It affects the Jew not only in his status as a member of society but, even more tragically, it breaks down his morale as an individual. It not only crushes the Jew as a citizen, but it burns into his soul a devastating sense of inferiority. It is advisable, therefore, that Jews review their defenses against this menace.

Before we can rid ourselves of the plague of antisemitism we must first understand its origins, its causes and its aims. Herein lies the first difficulty. The Jew is not conscious of any degree of wrongdoing that justifies the almost insane hate of him which possesses some people. It is fairly obvious, however, that antisemitism has not arisen out of a vacuum. Students of the subject are generally agreed that it has causes of a historico-psychological nature among which they list religious difference, economic maladjustment, chauvinist nationalism, and the mysterious workings of the ego. It is not easy to determine which of these causes are basic and which are derived. It is even possible that some are only rationalizations of more fundamental causes.

Many antisemites think that their dislike of Jews is instinctive—that it is due to a consciousness of the baneful racial characteristics of the Jew. Many of them today honestly believe that their rejection of the Jew is motivated by the desire to protect their own race. It is an alluring thought: the geographical state can fulfill its cultural mission only if

all its people are closely integrated racially and if all different (and by inference, inferior) racial groups are firmly and inexorably eliminated.

It is a significant fact that the attack on the Jews has been most bitter, for the last eight hundred years, during periods of economic crisis and economic transition. It has been quite immaterial whether the economic background was of an agrarian-handicraft or of a capitalistic type. The Jews have stood out as a group closely identified with a money economy, and during any period of financial stress it was inevitable that this minority should be singled out for suspicion.<sup>1</sup> This has been particularly true inasmuch as responsible political and economic leaders have frequently diverted the hatred of the masses from themselves by directing it towards the Jews.

In considering the causes that make for dislike of the Jew, many students have come to believe that religious difference no longer plays any part in turning Christians against Jews. It is, however, generally agreed that until the introduction of the lay and free public school in the middle of the nineteenth century, the teachings of practically all churches made for at least contempt of the Jew. But one is forced to ask whether there has been any appreciable change since that time in the religious teachings of the average conservative Protestant sect and of the Roman Catholic Church with respect to the Jew. The fact is that in both groups the great mass of Christian children are still taught a drama of Christian salvation in which the Jew is always the villain. The responsibility of Christian religious teachings for the present unchristian attitude toward the Jew must not be underrated.<sup>2</sup>

It is very probable that racial and religious prejudices are the result of religious indoctrination. It is even possible that economic envy, as directed toward the Jew, is an artificial creation. But the distrust of the Jew because he is different lies deeply and naturally rooted in the human psyche.

To a certain degree the Jew is different. He is an ethnic and religious minority. Many gentiles look upon him as a creature without a homeland, a wanderer who has had no country of his own for the last two thousand years. He is found everywhere. There is a physiognomy which characterizes a not inconsiderable percentage of Jews and is considered

<sup>1</sup> See the essay by B. Weinryb above, p. 17-34.

<sup>2</sup> See the essay by Solomon Grayzel below, p. 79-92.



typically Jewish. As a result of historical and environmental conditions many Jews evidence definite mannerisms. Even in their vocations they occupy a narrowly circumscribed field, being limited to specific branches of commerce and the professions. They are the followers of what is practically the only non-Christian religion in the Western world. Furthermore they do not intermarry to an appreciable degree. Not a few of this differing group have achieved a marked degree of success in intellectual and economic pursuits. Ruling classes with traditional vested political and economic interests look askance at their ability, the struggling petty bourgeois envy them and both these groups compensate for the real or imagined superiority of the Jew by hating or attacking him. The antipathy of certain scholarly Christian historians and theologians is probably intensified consciously or unconsciously by the realization that Christianity owes its origin to Judaism. Furthermore it is instinctive for the majority group to resent the minority whether that minority be servile or imperious. In this group-distrust of the dissimilar there certainly abides one of the deepest roots of anti-Jewish sentiment.

When we consider the problem of setting up moral and intellectual defenses against antisemitism, we must face the undeniable fact that the causes which have produced antisemitism are largely inherent in the social order. The accomplishment of our purpose, therefore, presupposes the alteration of some of the basic principles and institutions of our society. And this is no mean task. The need for radical change is particularly stressed by communist ideologists. They contend that the basic source of antisemitism is the economic disorder of society. All other causes, they say, are either minor or they are mere rationalizations. Antisemitism is a by-product of capitalism. It is because the Jew is the weakest, and yet at the same time one of the most typical figures of the unjust capitalist economy, that he is singled out for attack by the masses. The attack on the Jew, they tell us, is thus merely an expedient, a substitute for an attack on capitalism. Agrarian and industrial magnates and conservative statesmen have frequently utilized antisemitism to turn the economically distressed against the Jew and thus to divert attention from themselves, the real culprits. Socialization of all wealth, we are informed, would solve the Jewish problem by removing the inciting capitalists, and by according to all individuals equal economic opportunity and security.

In spite of the fact that the communist analysis of and cure for Judeophobia deserves a more critical scrutiny, we may, nevertheless, assume, for the purpose of our argument, that they are correct. What price, however, would the Jew have to pay for such immunity? He would in the first place have to surrender the capitalistic outlook to which the great majority of Jews adhere. He would have to withstand the tremendous social pressure of his environment which is rabidly anti-communistic. He would have to surrender personal liberties of the type included in our Bill of Rights for the duration of a dictatorship of the proletariat. More significant is the fact that he would have to fit into a politico-economic system where religious affiliation brings real disabilities. Judaism, as a religion, cannot live a normal life under Marxian communism, and a very appreciable proportion of Jews are still religionists. So that even if we admit that communism would eliminate antisemitism there is no question but that the great mass of Jews today—whether they are right or wrong—would not accept this solution.

The Marxians are unquestionably correct in emphasizing the need for a widespread change in the nature of our economic structure. It is hard to believe that any mere vocational shift of the Jew to crafts and agriculture, away from commerce and the professions, would really help to allay attack. What is important is that periodic financial dislocations be controlled and economic opportunity be made more general. The restless masses will not cease to rise in protest until they are guaranteed economic security. There must be economic peace before there can be social peace.

It would be a mistake, I believe, to lay too much weight on the danger from the new race theories. Sound scientific rejection of racism has been universal, and the impossibility of manufacturing a Nordic German race became so obvious that it has impressed itself even on the National Socialist leaders. The racist theory as a justification for anti-Jewish discrimination was liquidated by the Third Reich. The Nuremberg legislation of September, 1935 abandoned the pseudo-scientific concept of Aryans and non-Aryans, and laconically knew only Jews and non-Jews. Future Jewish well-being depends on the type of nationalism which will prevail. In a state where kindred ethnic origin, uniformity in religion, folkways, and group institutions are a prerequisite for citizenship, the Jew, as a Jew, cannot hope to be tolerated permanently. The

Jew must defend himself by encouraging belief in a type of state wherein various groups are not merely tolerated but admitted as of right and even admired for their specific cultural contribution. In a truly democratic structure it is difficult for antisemitism to become a real menace to the Jew or to the body politic. Liberal states normally make for liberal indoctrination—if they are wise.

A Jewish state large enough to contain millions of Jews and adequate to support them is another obvious solution to antisemitism, but it is patent that Palestine will find it almost impossible to serve this purpose. There has been a tendency to overestimate the role that Zionism can play in combatting prejudice against the Jew. Contrary to the belief of some Zionist ideologists I question whether the status of Jewish dignity in the diaspora will improve through the creation of a Jewish homeland. We have no reason to assume that the antisemite will heave overboard his antagonism against the "wandering" Jew the moment he discovers that the Jew, who will still remain ubiquitous, has attained some degree of respectability by the acquisition of a political homeland. But it would be wrong to fail to realize what an important part Zionism is playing in this contemporary drama of antisemitism, for Palestine is practically the only land which offers a haven of refuge to the victims of anti-Jewish prejudice. But it is more than a physical palliative. It is a messianic hope in the form of a political and social ideal, strengthening the morale of millions who feel that the world about them has failed to understand them.

In the realm of intellectual defense, false charges against the Jew should not be left unchallenged. It is important that impressionable adolescents at school learn their Shakespeare from some other drama than *The Merchant of Venice*; old English ritual murder ballads should be omitted from textbooks, unless you would have people believing in this myth. The term Jew as a synonym for cunning, cheat, and usurer should be deleted from the dictionary and the thesaurus of synonyms. Libel laws to protect the Jews as a group have been very helpful in some countries. Antisemitism has been outlawed in the Soviet Republics. Good-will movements created to bring about better relations between Jew and Christian are genuinely helpful. It is true that they are frequently sneered at by the sophisticated, but if they have no validity then neither have international conferences nor any institute designed to bring

people together to iron out their misunderstandings.

In order to preclude prejudice at its very source it might be exceedingly helpful if an authoritative joint committee of Jews and Christians undertook to examine all Protestant and Catholic religious textbooks with a view to determining what part, if any, they play in inculcating suspicion or hate of the Jew. Steps in this direction have already been taken by several organizations, but a great deal more still remains to be done in the more orthodox Christian religious schools. Such a commission might go even further and consider the advisability of recommending the frank and sympathetic treatment of the Jewish problem in Christian religious textbooks with the hope that the rising generation, if it does not like the Jew, will at least make an attempt to understand him and to be just to him. And while this commission is engaged in the task it might undertake to analyze the curricula and conduct of our great youth organizations to determine whether they make for sympathy and tolerance for all groups or for a narrow nationalism and an ultimate fascism.

It is important that the ethical note be emphasized in national and international thinking and action. The state in its relation to its component groups and in its relation to the states beyond its borders ought to be motivated by a broad concept of humanitarian justice. The concept of *Staatsräson* by which the state arrogates to itself the right to create its own moral standards in national conduct is inherently immoral. Also the hallowed belief that no state has a right to interfere in the inner life of a foreign power, a belief which tolerates gross abuses against helpless minorities, must be revamped. A concept of spiritual community among the nations of the world will go far toward bettering the position of the Jew in all lands. Nor are the Jews themselves without obligation in this matter. The individual Jew must become more conscious of the need of greater moral responsibility in his own life. It must be remarked that the Jews are frequently judged and condemned as a group because of the actions of a single individual.

It is not too much to hope that as the world gradually expands its sympathies it will view the Jewish minority in a different light. Minority groups have occasionally in history succeeded not only in winning a measure of tolerance for themselves but even a large degree of admiration. A striking illustration is the case of the pacifist Quakers of the

United States who were first hanged like common criminals but who are now revered for their group character. To this hope for a greater tolerance the average Jew might protest with indignation that true liberalism should never even require of him that he justify his existence as a minority. The answer is that no matter what hopes we cherish of a future elimination of the prejudices of the many against the one, actually we are at this moment a minority facing a majority, and majorities still insist that minorities justify their persistent separateness or disappear.

Through what media, one may ask, shall the Jew attempt to carry on his program of improving his position, a program as broad as liberal political, economic, ethical and cultural aspiration itself? The Jew's hope is humanity's hope. There are a host of liberal institutions, groups and bodies making for a more ethical society. The Jew should associate himself with them as his individual proclivities prompt him, and work to effectuate their goals. There are also a large number of Jewish societies that concern themselves directly with the Jewish problem and with these he may align himself.

There is no need to create new Jewish organizations to meet this problem of security. The moment the Jew left his ghetto and faced an industrialized world which was willing to emancipate him—at a price—he had to make his adjustment. It is hardly an exaggeration to maintain that since the days of the establishment of the Board of Deputies of British Jews in 1760 practically every Jewish institution, including the cult societies, has been motivated by the need and desire to fit harmoniously and securely into the general social environment. Even the various Jewish cultural societies and their literary productions, beginning with the Verein für Cultur und Wissenschaft der Juden in 1819 and going down through the *Jewish Encyclopedia* in 1901, have been prompted in large part by the desire to have the world at large really understand the Jew and thus accept him without reservation. The Jews have realized for a long time that the gentile world was adjusting itself only with great difficulty to an emancipated Jewry. To help himself, therefore, the Jew has created a host of institutions. It is imperative, however, that there be closer liaison and integration between all existing Jewish organizations and that they envisage the Jewish problem on a much broader scale. The creation of the National Community Relations Advisory Council (1944) was a step in the right direction, but this new Council must be

given considerably more authority if it is to effectively co-ordinate the labors of the major Jewish civic-defense bodies. The problem of the Jew, we repeat, however, is not so much the problem of the Jew as the problem of humanity, of society as a whole which must be educated toward more rational attitudes.

One might counter to this simple statement of hopes that nothing new is offered here, that this is no real solution to the pressing problem of antisemitism. One might say that this suggestion means in large part merely the raising of the ethical *niveau* of society, and that we have been trying to do this for generations. One might object further that all these suggestions have been tried, particularly in Germany, the classical land of apologetics, and they have failed ignominiously. And finally one might hold that antisemitism is an irrational philosophy, and that therefore rational procedures are of no avail.

How valid is this argument? There is one assumption which we shall have to accept, namely, that society as a whole is fundamentally rational and potentially humanitarian. If this premise is not admissible, then the historic group known as the Jews must continue to look forward to the future with apprehension. The only hope of the Jews, I believe, lies in an appeal to the masses whose rationality and educability we must assume. This hope is not a treacherous one. The policy of having faith in humanity and of striving to enlighten it with respect to ourselves has been historically effective. It has not failed even in Germany. Recall, if you will, that the German Holy Roman Empire was also the classical land of medieval brutality toward the Jew. Literally hundreds and thousands of Jews were cruelly done to death over a period of centuries. The tradition of bitter hate toward the Jew has been ploughed deep within every furrow of German soil; it has seeped into the subconsciousness of a people which is stained with the blood of twenty-five generations of slaughtered Jews. Yet in spite of this primeval urge to hate and to destroy, in spite of the almost strangling hold of the German past on the soul of the German, he succeeded to an astounding degree in throwing off the incubus of his own tradition. The nineteenth century with its flowering of enlightenment, education and humanitarianism, made a profound impression on him. The furious onset of antisemitic propaganda and systematic mass agitation of the 'seventies of the last century staggered the German but did not sweep him off his feet. As late as 1932 Germany

did not re-enact a single anti-Jewish law in spite of its centuries of intense anti-Jewish tradition and propaganda. In no free election have the anti-semites ever gained a majority of German votes on a clear anti-Jewish issue. Antisemitism, I believe, is not predominant in the thoughts of the great mass of the German people even today. I do not maintain that they are philosemites!

I say all this in spite of the fact that I realize the cynical cruelty and the utter brutality which prevailed in Germany. But I insist that it would be wrong and would indicate a woeful lack of historical perspective to draw the conclusion, as many do, that liberalism has collapsed throughout the world and particularly in Germany. The anti-Jewish German legislation was the action of a limited group of patriotic bigots or criminal adventurers who succeeded through violence and terrorism in imposing their antisemitism on the great mass of the German people. I do not believe that the majority of the German people in a *free* election would ever have subscribed to the antisemitic program of the National Socialist Party. Furthermore, reflection will make us realize that the general humanitarian attitude has so progressed that the German mistreatment of the Jew has been condemned abroad almost universally. The goal of all our educational efforts must be to bulwark the masses of the people everywhere with a sense of sympathy and justice toward all groups, so that even in times of abnormal stress no one will be able to rally an appreciable minority around himself on the ground of antisemitism.

There is no easy solution to our problem. It will be a long hard pull through centuries. Antisemitism, we know, is but one phase of the larger problem of universal spiritual adjustment and social justice. In a more limited sense it is a phase of the incipient process of the emancipation of the Jew by the non-Jew. It is just about a generation since the bulk of world Jewry was emancipated. The grandfather of practically every Jew in the United States was born without adequate civil and political rights. You cannot wrench fifteen hundred years of prejudice out of the hearts of the Western world in less than one generation. Emancipation did not well forth from the hearts of the masses; it was imposed by the minds of philosophers and statesmen. The concept of emancipation has not yet matured in the souls of the masses.

I know that Jews, human beings, are being crushed almost under our eyes. We are desperate for immediate salvation, but the kingdom of

heaven is not yet at hand. We will have to work zealously and courageously with liberal groups everywhere, struggling with them to insist upon a real implementation of the new United Nations Charter. Herein lies a real hope for the future.



*Part II:*

HISTORICAL AND REGIONAL STUDIES



## ANTISEMITISM IN THE HELLENISTIC-ROMAN WORLD

By RALPH MARCUS

"Antisemitism" is here used to mean the expression of hostility toward Jews felt by the government or subjects of a state in which Jews are settled in sufficient numbers to be considered an alien minority. This hostility, so far as it is consciously felt and rationalized, arises from the belief that the Jews are a separate and unassimilable element in the state because they differ from their neighbors in religion or culture or in social and political and economic status, whether in several or all of these respects.

It is the business of the social psychologist to analyze the instinctive factors involved in this feeling of difference. We can all, however, recognize certain general human traits and sentiments which underlie anti-semitism in any period in any part of the world. They may be concisely summarized as follows: (1) distrust of an alien group, and credulity toward lies and exaggerations concerning its beliefs and conduct, particularly in matters of religion; (2) resentment of competition in business and professions or of the privileged social, political or economic position of an alien group; (3) the tendency of the poorer classes to look for a scapegoat on which to blame their misery, and the opportunism of demagogues in diverting the resentment of the poorer classes into hatred of an alien minority.

These general human tendencies were as active in the Hellenistic-Roman period as at any later time. Before considering the concrete forms which they assumed we may notice the particular characteristics of the Jews as a group which were likely to offend the prejudices of their neighbors at that time. The Jews were very proud of their religion and their social customs and did not conceal their contempt for pagan religions, especially the worship of animal-gods in Egypt. The Jews were also careful to maintain their separateness from gentiles in matters of diet, observance of the Sabbath and the like, and appeared to their neighbors to be exclusive, clannish and, as the Greeks called it, "misanthropic." The Jews were insistent and aggressive in claiming political rights and privileges, usually such as were made necessary by their peculiar religious

customs. Finally, the Jews as individuals, and in some states as a group, were often favored politically or economically by the Macedonian or Roman ruler over against the gentile population of the state and thus appeared to their neighbors as aliens protected by royal favoritism.

Before dealing with antisemitism in the Hellenistic-Roman period, we may pause to consider an incident which occurred in the preceding period, when the diaspora really began in the West. During the fifth century B.C.E. there was a Jewish colony settled at Elephantine in Upper Egypt, which had been placed there as a border garrison by the Persians who ruled Egypt at that time. From the Aramaic papyri discovered there a few decades ago we learn that the Jews were attacked by the local Egyptians and their temple partly destroyed. In this case the hostility of the Egyptians was not due merely to religious differences, because the Jewish settlers were partly assimilated and had intermarried with the Egyptians to some extent. The chief reason for the attack was probably that in the eyes of the native Egyptians the Jews were the agents of the hated foreign power, Persia, and a revival of Egyptian nationalist feeling at the end of the fifth century B.C.E. naturally took the form of an attack on the Jewish alien minority. Here for the first time we have an instance of antisemitism based on the feeling of a subject population that the Jews were the instruments of their foreign oppressors. This instance of antisemitism at Elephantine in the Persian period has been cited because it shows so clearly the result of a situation which was to recur frequently in later periods, namely, that the Jews were not only regarded as aliens but as aliens favored by a foreign ruler above the native population.

At the end of the fourth century B.C.E. the Persian empire surrendered its territory in western Asia and Egypt to the Macedonian king, Alexander the Great. Not long after the death of Alexander, in 323 B.C.E., his vast empire was partitioned among his generals; Egypt fell to Ptolemy I, whose descendants ruled that country for almost three hundred years until it became a Roman province in 30 B.C.E. Palestine also became a Ptolemaic possession and remained in Egypt's control until about 200 B.C.E., when the rival dynasty of the Seleucids, whose capital was at Antioch in Syria, conquered it and governed it for some fifty years until the Jews under the leadership of Hasmonians won their independence.

The most important Jewish settlements in the diaspora down to about 100 B.C.E. were in Ptolemaic Egypt, Seleucid Syria and the more or less independent city-states on the coast of Asia Minor. During this period, from about 300 to 100 B.C.E., there is little evidence of wide-spread or intensive antisemitism, at least in the diaspora with which we are here concerned. We may, however, pause to consider the events which occurred in Palestine just before and during the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, which most people regard as clear evidence of antisemitism. A careful study of political conditions in Judaea and of the general policy of Antiochus makes it clear that the Seleucid king's attempt to interfere with the religious practises of the Jews was not really due to antisemitism, as we have defined the term. Antiochus Epiphanes inherited from his predecessors the obligation to pay a large war-indemnity to Rome and was badly in need of money; hence his expropriations of temple-treasures, not only in Jerusalem but in other cities of his empire. Moreover, he was anxious to unify his empire, which consisted of racially and culturally diverse nations—Jews, Syrians, Greeks, Iranians and others—in order to oppose a strong and homogeneous force to his chief enemy, Rome. It was for that reason that he attempted to Hellenize the native population by combining some elements of Greek religion and culture with their own. Finally, he knew that there was a party of Jewish leaders in Jerusalem who favored the Ptolemies and were hostile to the Seleucids, and when on one occasion he returned from Egypt after an unsuccessful attempt to seize the country and found that some of his Jewish officials in Jerusalem, who approved of his Hellenizing plans, had been driven from the city by the pro-Ptolemaic party, he attacked the city and ordered the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judaea to conform to his program of Hellenization, which of course meant violating the traditional practices of Judaism. It cannot, therefore, be said that the persecution of pious Jews and the plundering of the temple in Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes were simply manifestations of antisemitism.

## I

There was a large settlement of Jews in Ptolemaic Egypt, most of them living in the capital, Alexandria, and a good many in the large cities of lower and middle Egypt. The Jews in Alexandria were probably not possessed of full civic rights, as Josephus claims, but they un-

doubtedly had certain privileges which made their social and economic status about as favorable as that of the Macedonians, who were full citizens, and superior to that of the native Egyptians. We must remember that in the countries governed by the Macedonian successors of Alexander the Great civic status was regulated by much the same principle which had obtained in the Greek city-state of the classical period. Full rights of citizenship were extended to free persons of Macedonian or Greek descent, who were expected to participate in the official religious cults of the state. Beside the citizen-body there might be legally recognized communities or *politeumata* of aliens and at the bottom of the list came the large mass of natives and slaves. Now the Jews of Alexandria (so far as we can judge from the sources of the Roman period, a little later) formed a separate and compact community or *politeuma* with their own magistrates, courts and religious institutions. They were, of course, subject to the general laws of the state, but were probably protected in the observance of their customs by being exempted from attendance at court on the Sabbath, or from having to join in the worship of pagan gods officially honored by the ruler. There can hardly be any doubt that the native Egyptians in Alexandria resented the preferential treatment, as it must have seemed to them, accorded to the Jews.

We may now briefly indicate the chief incidents of hostility shown toward the Jews in Ptolemaic Egypt. Unfortunately the sources for the period for the first century and a half are so scanty that we can only say that no evidence exists of real opposition on the part of the Macedonian rulers during this time. The fragments of the writings of Greek historians preserved by Josephus and later Christian writers, the half-legendary work known as the *Letter of Aristeas*, which relates the reception accorded the Palestinian translators of the Pentateuch into Greek by Ptolemy II Philadelphus, and some few inscriptions, including dedications of synagogues to the Ptolemaic king and queen, all indicate that the Jews were fairly well treated. This is not surprising in view of the fact that during most of this period the Ptolemies also ruled Palestine and Transjordan and collected considerable revenue from this Jewish territory, which would be one reason for them to adopt a friendly policy toward the Jews in Egypt.

It is true that the apocryphal *III Maccabees* relates the story of a persecution by Ptolemy IV Philopator, but modern scholars generally

agree that whatever historical basis there is for this story must be dated at a considerably later time, either the reign of Ptolemy VII Physcon, with whom Josephus connects this persecution, or that of Ptolemy Lathyrus, who was opposed by the Jewish generals of his mother Cleopatra with whom he was at war. Moreover the figure of Ptolemy Philopator in this apocryphal book is in part modelled on that of Antiochus Epiphanes in *II Maccabees* and shows that the author was writing some time after the date when *II Maccabees* was composed, that is, some time after 100 B.C.E. As for the alleged bias of the Egyptian historian Manetho who wrote a history of Egypt in Greek during the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, we shall consider that work in connection with the discussion of anti-semitic literature.

It may be that Ptolemy VII Physcon, who reigned in the middle of the second century B.C.E., was hostile to the Jews for at least a time, because a large number of Jews sided with his brother and rival Ptolemy VI Philometor, but if so his attitude was based on a definite political cause and can hardly be said to reflect a general prejudice against Jews as such. A similar motivation lies behind the anti-Jewish attitude of Ptolemy Lathyrus, about 100 B.C.E., but in his case the feeling seems to have been more violent and general (he was equally hostile to the Jews of Palestine); he has therefore been called by Bell, the English papyrologist, "the first representative of political antisemitism." It was probably not until his reign that Jews had obtained important political positions in Egypt and hence were an element to be reckoned with by a ruler who aspired to carry out a program of nationalist absolutism. We know from the papyri that a number of Jews had obtained minor posts in the Ptolemaic bureaucracy as tax-collectors and customs-inspectors, and it is likely that the oppressed natives resented the presence of aliens in these unpopular posts with particular bitterness. Moreover, as indicated above, at least two Jews, Ananias and Chelkias (in Hebrew, Hananiah and Hilkiyah), occupied the important office of general in the army of Ptolemy's mother, Cleopatra. When in 54 B.C.E. Julius Caesar invaded Egypt and was threatened with defeat by an Egyptian force, it was a garrison of Jews from the colony at Heliopolis, settled there about 160 B.C.E. by Onias the refugee High Priest, which came to his aid at the bidding of the High Priest Hyrcanus and so made clear to the Egyptians how powerful a force the alien minority could be. The favor shown the

Jews in the diaspora by Caesar and his successors naturally provoked a reaction among the natives of the countries subject to Rome, as we shall see in the section on Jews under the Roman empire.

When Alexander's empire was divided into three large areas soon after his death, the territories in the East, including Asia Minor and Syria, fell to another Macedonian family, that of Seleucus. For a century, between 300 and 200 B.C.E., the Seleucids disputed the possessions of Palestine proper with the Ptolemies but were forced to leave it to the latter, until its final conquest by Antiochus III the Great. From an early period there were Jews settled in the Hellenized cities on the coast of Asia Minor and in Syria, notably in the capital, Antioch, and our sources indicate that they enjoyed much the same special privileges in these cities that they did at Alexandria. It is doubtful whether much reliance can be placed on the statements of Josephus that the founder of this dynasty, Seleucus Nicator, and his immediate successors gave the Jews full citizen rights; it is, however, possible that the Jews were granted *isopoliteia*, that is, equality of rights with the Macedonians. This would mean not that they had identical rights with the Macedonians but special privileges which enabled them to enjoy about the same political and economic position that the favored gentile citizens had. The fact that in the reign of Augustus some of the Ionian cities appealed to Augustus' viceroy, Marcus Agrippa, to abrogate the rights and privileges of their Jewish communities (which, incidentally, he refused to do) would indicate that the Jews had actually been granted such rights in the Seleucid period. For the reign of Antiochus III, Josephus cites explicitly certain decrees of the king; one is a letter to his governor, Zeuxis, ordering him to transplant 2,000 Jewish families from Mesopotamia to Phrygia and Lydia, where there was a revolt. This letter, the authenticity of which may be considered certain, clearly shows that the king regarded the Jews as a loyal and stable element of the population. Apparently, like Julius Caesar after him, he regarded the Jews as a sort of cement to bind together the diverse ethnic elements of his kingdom. Another decree of the same king, quoted in full by Josephus, grants certain civic rights to the Jews of Jerusalem but with this we need not be concerned. As against these probable instances of governmental favor, we must place the attitude of the Syrian natives and the Greek citizens of the city-states in the Seleucid kingdom, who undoubtedly resented the presence of consider-



able numbers of Jews, protected in their religious customs and thus allowed to remain unassimilated to the culture of the majority. Because the culture of the Seleucid cities was higher than that of most Egyptian cities, we may suppose that antisemitism was largely based on cultural grounds, and found among the ruling classes, whereas in Egypt it was more largely social and economic and prevalent among the Egyptian natives. However, the imperfectly Hellenized Syrian masses in these cities were a potential reservoir of vicious and violent antisemitism, as can be seen from the bloody attacks made on the Jews during the first century C.E. and after. The unsuccessful attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to Hellenize the Jews of Palestine in 170-168 B.C.E. must have had immediate consequences on the Jews settled elsewhere in his kingdom. The attitude toward the Jews of Seleucid Syria must also have been greatly influenced by the fact that under the Hasmoneans the Jews of Palestine seized the opportunity presented by the internecine struggles of rival claimants to the Seleucid throne to regain their national independence and on several occasions to invade Syrian territory and inflict much damage on it.

## II

After 200 B.C.E. when Rome had disposed of her western rival, Carthage, in the second Punic War, she was free to turn her attention to the East, and became, in the course of the next two centuries, the mistress of the whole Mediterranean world. The first direct contact of Jews and Romans took the form of a treaty between them made in the time of Judas Maccabaeus, when the Romans were jealous of the Seleucids' power and their attempt to seize Egypt, which Rome regarded as a protectorate. For that reason Rome was ready to give at least nominal support to the small Jewish state which was at war with the Seleucids. Of the treatment given the Jewish community in Rome we know practically nothing until we come to the time of Cicero. This famous Roman orator in 59 B.C.E. delivered a speech in defense of Lucius Valerius Flaccus, an ex-governor of the province of Asia (in Asia Minor), who had been charged with embezzlement and sacrilege in having, among other things, seized money collected by the Jews of that province for the temple in Jerusalem. In the course of this speech Cicero takes occasion to make a number of unflattering remarks about the Jews,

especially the Jews of Rome. He calls attention to the danger of stirring up the large, united and aggressive Jewish community, as he describes it.

Next comes the malicious accusation about the gold of the Jews. No doubt that is the reason why this case is being tried so near the Aurelian terrace. It is this count in the indictment, Laelius, that has made you pick out this place, and that is responsible for the crowd about us. You know very well how numerous that class is, with what unanimity they act, and what strength they exhibit in the political meetings. But I shall frustrate their purpose. I shall speak in a low tone, just loud enough for the jury to hear. There is no lack of men, as you very well know, to stir these fellows up against me and every patriotic citizen; and I have no intention of making the task of such mischief-makers lighter by any act of mine.<sup>1</sup>

Cicero also emphasizes Flaccus' merit in interfering with a "foreign superstition" and the fact that even when the Jews and Romans were at peace, they had nothing in common culturally; now that the Jews have opposed the Roman army, during the invasion of Palestine by Pompey in 63 B.C.E., there was even less reason for the Romans to respect their religious customs.

Religious scruples, my dear Laelius, are primarily national concerns. We have our own, and other states have theirs. And as a matter of fact, even while Jerusalem was standing, and the Jews were at peace with us, there was very little in common between the religious customs of which their rites are examples and those which befit an empire as splendid as ours, or a people of our character and dignity. Our ancestral institutions are as different from theirs as they well can be. Now, however, there surely can be all the less obligation upon us to respect Jewish religious observances when the nation has demonstrated in arms what its feelings are toward Rome, and has made clear how far it enjoyed divine protection by the fact that it has been conquered, scattered, enslaved.<sup>2</sup>

A number of interesting conclusions may be drawn from these references to the Jews by Cicero. There was a noticeably large community of Jews in Rome in his time. (We are not here concerned with the problem whether the majority of them had recently come to Rome as captives of Pompey or had been settled in Rome for some time.) They were unitedly insistent on having their peculiar customs respected and the Romans were contemptuous of these Jewish customs. Even if we make allowances for the exaggerations and unfair insinuations of a clever lawyer desperately pleading for an obviously guilty client, as well as for the

<sup>1</sup> *Pro Flacco*, 66, M. Radin's translation.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 67.

contempt of the upper class Romans for "barbarians" generally, we must be impressed by the fact that the Jews in Rome were beginning to incur the suspicion of the Romans because of the growth of their community in that city and the unanimity of Jewish action in self-defense among the Jewish communities of the empire. As for the contempt aroused by Jewish religious practices, we have many indications of this in later Latin literature, as we shall see below. This contempt was doubtless as openly expressed as was that of the Jews for the idolatrous practices of their gentile neighbors in the Greek cities, as we see from the Jewish writings in Greek which have been preserved, such as *The Wisdom of Solomon*, the *Sibylline Oracles*, *IV Maccabees* and other books.

How far the lower classes in Rome shared this suspicion and contempt we have no means of knowing. Apparently the situation was not so bad at Rome itself as at Roman Alexandria, because in the former city the Jews did not form a privileged class as over against the native population, and there seemed not to have been professional antisemites and demagogues to rouse the passions of the mob against the Jews.

The Jewish policy of Rome's first emperors such as Julius Caesar and Augustus was one of friendly tolerance. Caesar's chief reason for taking a friendly interest in them was probably that he felt he owed a debt of gratitude to the Jews for the help they had given him during his struggle with Pompey. Also, as the German historian Mommsen has pointed out, he probably regarded the Jews as politically and economically useful because of their international connections.

The official Roman attitude towards the Jews in the Greek cities of the empire is illustrated by a number of decrees of the time of Julius Caesar which are preserved in Book XIV of Josephus' *Antiquities*. We may cite two of these decrees as examples.

In the presidency of Artemon, on the first day of the month of Lenaeon, Dolabella, Imperator, to the magistrates, council and people of Ephesus greeting. Alexander son of Theodorus, the envoy of Hyrcanus, son of Alexander, the high priest and ethnarch of the Jews, has explained to me that his coreligionists cannot undertake military service because they may not bear arms or march on the days of the Sabbath; nor can they obtain supplies of the native foods to which they are accustomed. I, therefore, like the governors before me, grant them exemption from military service and allow them to follow their native customs and to come together for sacred holy rites in accordance with their law, and to make offerings for

their sacrifices; and it is my wish that you write these instructions to the various cities.<sup>3</sup>

Decree of the people of Sardis. The following decree was passed by the council and people on the motion of the magistrates. Whereas the Jewish citizens living in our city have continually received many great privileges from the people and have now come before the council and the people and have pleaded that as their laws and freedom have been restored to them by the Roman Senate and people, they may in accordance with their accepted customs come together and have a communal life and adjudicate disputes among themselves, and that a place be given them in which they may gather together with their wives and children and offer their native prayers and sacrifices to God, it has therefore been decreed by the council and people that permission shall be given them to come together on stated days to do these things which are in accordance with their laws, and also that a place shall be set apart by the magistrates for them to build and inhabit, such as they may consider suitable for this purpose, and that the market-officials of the city shall be charged with the duty of having food for them brought in.<sup>4</sup>

These decrees and the others quoted by Josephus show that the Jews enjoyed a privileged position in the Hellenistic cities of the Roman provinces and that the local magistrates were inclined to put difficulties in the way of their customary observances but were restrained from doing so by the Roman rulers. These Roman privileges or "immunities," as they may be called in view of their resemblance to the charters issued to the Jews by the German emperors in the Middle Ages, furnish another illustration of the situation which existed throughout most of the Hellenistic-Roman diaspora, namely, that the Jews were given exceptional status in the Hellenistic cities through the special protective interest shown in them by the Ptolemaic or Seleucid king or Roman emperor. Such charters must have been welcome to the Jewish beneficiaries, but at the same time they must have increased the hostility of the gentile populations. This anti-Jewish feeling made itself felt in violent conflicts when the government was temporarily unable or unwilling to protect the Jews, as on several memorable occasions during the first century C.E. in Alexandria, Antioch, Caesarea and elsewhere.

### III

We have a good deal of information about the visible manifestations

<sup>3</sup> *Ant.*, xiv, 225 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 259 ff.

of antisemitism in Alexandria during the first century C.E., thanks to the detailed accounts of Philo and Josephus, which can be supplemented from a number of papyri. And as Alexandria was the center of anti-Jewish propaganda during the early imperial era, we may consider this community as a sort of sociological laboratory in which to make sufficiently accurate observations to warrant our drawing certain conclusions.

The Jewish settlement in Alexandria was the most populous, wealthy and influential group of Jews in the entire diaspora. On the other hand, the native Egyptian population was justifiably discontented with its treatment by the Romans and was, as a result of this or in addition to this, notoriously unstable and turbulent, according to the express evidence of ancient writers. As for the Greek population, it had no reason to be pleased with Roman rule, especially as the Romans had deprived it of its senate, and had forced its magistrates to become largely ornamental. The dissatisfaction of both groups must have been greatly heightened when Augustus confirmed their Jewish fellow-residents in the rights and privileges which they had enjoyed under Ptolemaic rule and gave them a measure of self-government through their ethnarch and council of elders.

Although the Romans were fairly successful in stimulating trade, industry and agriculture in Egypt, they inevitably adopted some measures which further increased the dissatisfaction of the Greek and Egyptian elements. For example, in 20 B.C.E. the Roman governor (*praefectus*) Petronius transferred the property of the Egyptian temples to the state. This was deeply resented for nationalistic as well as religious reasons by the Egyptians of Alexandria and was the probable cause of the riots which occurred there during Petronius' term of office. This resentment must have been further increased by the deliberately malicious anti-Jewish propaganda spread by demagogues like Apion, who repeated the uncomplimentary statements about the Jews made by Manetho in his *History of Egypt*, and improved upon them by adding slanders and inventions of his own. Although Manetho, writing in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus (early 3rd century B.C.E.), could hardly have been a professed antisemite, nevertheless his account of the ignoble origin of the Jews lent itself to exploitation later by unscrupulous journalists like Apion and Chairemon.

With the accession to the imperial power of Gaius, popularly known

as Caligula, in 37 C.E. the ill feeling between gentiles and Jews in Alexandria (and in other cities, Caesarea, for example) became acute and violent. Here again we have an instance of the usual combination of circumstances that produced anti-Jewish outbreaks in antiquity. First there is long-smoldering resentment at the privileged social, political and economic position of the Jews; this is accompanied by more immediate resentment of the Jews' refusal to participate in the state cults or even to respect the religious beliefs of their gentile neighbors. The smoldering fire is whipped into flame by a sudden political manoeuvre on the part of the government or a faction in the city. Finally the flame is fanned into a blaze by demagogic speeches and pamphlets put out by professional anti-Jewish agitators who hope to profit materially from an attack on the Jews. The government is sometimes obliged to intervene, at least during the first century, to preserve order, penalizing the Jewish community for reasons of imperial policy. This is the pattern followed by the swiftly moving events which took place in Alexandria during the reigns of Caligula and Claudius.

The details of these riots at Alexandria are probably too well known to need repeating here. We may, however, briefly comment on the significant aspects of these incidents. Caligula's insistence on being worshipped as a god and having his statue set up in the temples of various cities throughout the empire need not of itself have led to irreconcilable conflict between the emperor and the Jews.<sup>5</sup> The Jews might well have persuaded him to accept sacrifices for his well-being in the temple of Jerusalem, such as were customary, as a substitute for actual worship of his image in their temple and synagogues. That this is not mere conjecture is shown by the fact that he eventually dismissed in a half-humorously contemptuous fashion the Jewish embassy which came from Alexandria to plead with him, remarking that the Jews were not so much bad people as unfortunate and stupid in refusing to believe that he was a god. The Jewish king Agrippa I had enough personal influence with Caligula to persuade him not to take extreme measures against the Jews of Alexandria for their failure to erect his statue in their synagogue. That Caligula was ready to go to greater lengths with the Jews of Palestine

<sup>5</sup> A contrary view is expressed by A. D. Nock in the *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. x, where he says that Caligula's attempt to secure divine honors may have been inspired by irritation with the Jews.

may be attributable to the distrust he felt of the Roman governor, Petronius, who had presumed to intervene on behalf of the Jews in that country. In any case the imperial decree merely served the advisers of Flaccus, the Roman governor in Egypt, as a pretext to divert the emperor's attention from the fact that they had allowed the Alexandrian mob to ridicule and insult his good friend King Agrippa when he arrived at Alexandria en route to Palestine. It was the proud behavior and royal ceremonial of Agrippa which was the real occasion of the anti-Jewish riots that resulted in the loss of Jewish lives and property. And that the Roman governor was soon after recalled in disgrace must have seemed to the antisemites another instance of the "international Jewish power" (to use a favorite phrase of modern antisemites), while to the Jewish theologian, Philo, it seemed merely another instance of divine retribution overtaking the oppressors of the innocent Jews.

How determined was the anti-Jewishness of certain intellectuals in Alexandria and how consistently it was maintained for several decades is shown by the fact that these same leaders were protesting against the imperial toleration of Jewish privileges in the reign of Claudius, and that the eventual punishment of some of them for the crime of *laesa maiestas* became the theme of a cycle of martyr-narratives that were popular a century later.

#### IV

Josephus has left us a very able defense of Jewish culture and morality against the attacks of those whom he considered the most formidable antisemites. This apologetic work *Contra Apionem* is valuable, among other things, because it has preserved at least fragments of writings about the Jews that otherwise might have wholly perished. Josephus covers a good deal of ground, and every person who is interested in the both depressing and fascinating subject of antisemitism would do well to read his detailed and unusually ingenious refutation of various calumnies about the Jews and his eloquent defense of the morality and soundness of the Mosaic law. We cannot examine here the many anti-Jewish charges which Josephus shows to be ridiculous and incredible; some of these are to the effect that the Jews were originally lepers driven out of Egypt, that they had been treacherous to the Ptolemaic kings of Egypt, that they sacrificed Greeks in the temple of Jerusalem (this slander was probably

first circulated by the propagandists of anti-Jewish Seleucid kings like Antiochus Epiphanes and some of his successors), that they worshipped an ass.<sup>6</sup>

After dealing with such malicious inventions or misconceptions Josephus proceeds to deal with the charges made by various pseudo-intellectuals such as Apion or Apollonius Molon and even real intellectuals such as the Stoic philosopher Posidonius of Apamea in Syria (who later taught at Rhodes, having Cicero as a pupil), that the Jews had no original culture, that they were merely imitators of the Greeks, that their exclusiveness was due to their hatred of non-Jews and that they were generally an undesirable element in the Hellenistic-Roman world. These charges led Josephus to end his exposition of the Mosaic laws with the proud assertion that Judaism is superior to Hellenism and that what is good in the latter is of Jewish origin. Josephus was not the first (having been anticipated by Alexandrian Jewish writers of the third century B.C.E.) but one of the most effective of those apologists who have sought to demonstrate that the Jews have made a great "contribution to civilization."

In addition to these excerpts from antisemitic writers preserved in *Contra Apionem*, there are a good many passages concerning the Jews in the writings of Greek and Roman historians, philosophers and satirists. These have been conveniently collected and edited (with a French translation) by the distinguished Jewish classical scholar, Théodore Reinach, in his *Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au Judaïsme*. Though this volume was published in 1895 it is still the most useful and comprehensive collection of references to the Jews in Greek and Latin literature.

A careful reading of these scattered passages from several centuries reveals the predominance of certain anti-Jewish themes, which have been correctly stressed by Reinach in the preface to his book, namely the social and religious particularism of the Jews. By refusing to allow any fusion of Judaism with pagan cults or emperor worship, the Jews made a conspicuous exception to the general practice of oriental cults in the

<sup>6</sup> This fable was probably based on the much older connection of the god Set, popularly but mistakenly represented as an ass, with the Semitic invaders of ancient Egypt; this erroneous conception was reinforced by the resemblance in sound between the Egyptian word for ass, *yao* or the like, and the pronunciation of the Hebrew divine name YHWH as *Yao* in Hellenistic times.



Hellenistic-Roman world. They insisted that their god was the only true god, even though he had no visible form which his worshippers could point to, unless it were the universe itself. They refused to associate freely with their gentile neighbors because the Mosaic laws of ritual purity made it impossible for them to do so. This was an attitude which alienated the vast majority of pagans, even those who might not have resented the political status of the Jews in the cities of the empire. At the same time it is interesting to note, as Heinemann has pointed out,<sup>7</sup> that the very intensity of the Jews' particularism and their imageless cult attracted a certain number of pagans, among whom they were active in proselytizing. But it should be remembered that their religious and social exclusiveness repelled far more than it attracted. And the fact that they were successful in winning some converts only increased the resentment of those pagans who regarded their customs with suspicion and contempt. This feeling finds expression in the works of a number of ancient writers that have come down to us, including those that mentioned the Jews more or less incidentally and were not professed anti-semitic tracts. We have space for quotation from only a few of these.

Trogus Pompeius was a Roman historian in the age of Augustus. In his account of Jewish history in the time of Moses (which has been preserved in the Abridgement of Justinus, a writer of the third century C.E.), he writes as follows:

And because they remembered that it was through fear of contagion that they had been driven out of Egypt, they were fearful lest they should be hated by the inhabitants (of Arabia) for the same reason, and took care that they should not come into contact with foreigners. And this custom, which arose from a specific occasion, he (Moses) gradually changed into a fixed institution and religious principle.

Half a century later the Roman satirist Petronius remarks (with several misstatements of fact about Jewish customs) that the Jews are very stubborn in insisting on the observance of all their peculiar rites.

A Jew may adore the swine as a divinity, and appeal to the ears of highest heaven; if, however, he does not circumcise himself and get rid of his foreskin, he will be cut off from his people and have to migrate to Greek cities, where he won't have to observe strictly the laws of fasting on the Sabbath.

<sup>7</sup> Heinemann, I., "The Attitude of the Ancient World Toward Judaism," in *The Review of Religion*, vol. iv (1940) 385-400.

Another, more famous, satirist, the poet Juvenal, writing in the second century C.E., enumerates converts to Judaism among those parents who corrupt their children by their example.

Some have by chance a father who observes the Sabbath. They worship nothing but the clouds and the divinity of heaven. They believe that the flesh of swine is no different from that of human beings, and so they abstain from eating it. Next they circumcise themselves. They become accustomed to despise Roman laws, and study, observe and revere only the Jewish law, whatever Moses has handed down in a secret volume—namely, to refuse to show a traveler the way unless he is a coreligionist, or to lead anyone to a drinking-place unless he is circumcised. And this they do because of a father who regards the seventh day as a day of idleness and does not take part in any of the usual activities of life.

Like Petronius, Juvenal misunderstands the reason for the refusal of the Jews to eat pork. In addition, Petronius shares the common misconception that the Jews fasted on the Sabbath. But in spite of these inaccuracies, they are probably only exaggerating, not inventing, the Jewish attitude of separatism from non-Jews.

Finally we may quote part of the long passage on the Jews given by the great Roman historian, Tacitus, in the fifth book of his *History* in connection with his account of the conquest of Jerusalem by Titus. Here we have a bitter condemnation of the Jews which is obviously unfair and prejudiced but none the less interesting because it probably represents the views of a great many educated Romans in the first century C.E.

These rites, however they were introduced, are defended on the ground of their antiquity. But their other institutions are sinister and shameful and have prevailed through their baseness. All the worst elements, scorning the religion of their fathers, have flocked to them, bringing tribute and offerings. From this has grown the influence of the Jews. Among themselves they show a stubborn loyalty and ready sympathy; but toward all outsiders they show hostility and hatred. They do not eat or sleep with strangers, and though they are a most libidinous race, they abstain from intercourse with foreign women. Among themselves nothing is unlawful. They introduced the practise of circumcision in order that they might be recognized by this distinguishing mark. Those who are converted to their customs observe the same practise. Nor are converts taught anything so soon as to despise the gods, to renounce their country, and to hold in contempt their parents, children and brothers.

## V

The "Jewish problem" in antiquity, as in the Middle Ages and in

modern times, is a particular aspect of the problem of minorities, accentuated because the Jews were a conspicuous minority. The very qualities which gave the Jews inspiration and courage to survive in an alien culture of which they disapproved were the qualities that led the gentiles to disapprove of them. This disapproval may have existed in varying degrees of intensity among the masses, the educated class and the government; but for the reasons we have given all three combined during the latter part of the Hellenistic-Roman period in an attempt to force the Jews to give up the ancestral customs that set them apart from the pagan majority. Judaism continued to be a tolerated cult (*religio licita*) in theory for several centuries after the period we have studied; but theory and practice sometimes widely diverge. The fact remains that it must have been a struggle for most Jews to remain loyal to Judaism while living in the cities of the Roman empire.

This is not the place to inquire into the problem of assimilation or to try to determine what proportion of Jews in the diaspora became Christians as a result of the missionary activities of Paul and his associates. While the early Christians became involved in conflicts with the state and were generally regarded with suspicion, as we know from such documents as the letter of Pliny to the emperor Trajan and the writings of the Christian apostles, converts to the new faith were not outwardly as distinct from gentiles as were the Jews. Besides, they offered a religion that preserved many of the beliefs and all of the sacred literature of the Jews without obliging their adherents at the same time to observe all the Mosaic practices. It may be conjectured, therefore, that a large number of Greek-speaking Jews became Christians. The very fact that Paul complains so bitterly about Jewish opposition to the new cult which he was preaching in the synagogues of the Hellenistic cities indicates that the Jewish authorities realized the danger to Judaism of the Christian appeal. But for the larger number of Jews who must have remained faithful to Judaism, judging from the reports of conflicts between Christians and Jews in the Roman empire during the second and third centuries, the same problems of adjustment to the Roman government and Hellenistic culture remained. The pattern of antisemitism in antiquity was essentially the same as that of antisemitism today.

Our task has been merely to study the historical phenomenon of antisemitism in the Hellenistic-Roman world. But from that study we may be permitted to draw some general conclusions of a more philosophical

nature. An objective appraisal of the various factors involved in this complex of social, political, economic, religious and cultural relations leads us to recognize that the only solution of the problem, in the sense of a lessening of tension between the Jewish and non-Jewish groups, seems to be the establishment of an international federation of states in which social and economic justice shall prevail, so far as is humanly possible, and in which the state will educate the young to believe that both individuals and the state are benefited by religious and cultural diversity within the framework of a democratic society.

At the same time it may be argued with considerable force, in view of recent events, that cultural pluralism has a better chance to develop more freely among federated states than within a single state. If this is true, Jewish culture has a better chance to survive in a Jewish national home in Palestine than in any part of the diaspora.

## CHRISTIAN-JEWISH RELATIONS IN THE FIRST MILLENNIUM

By SOLOMON GRAYZEL

My task is to discuss the rise and development of that spirit of intolerance on the one side and mistrust on the other which has characterized the relations between the Christians and the Jews. The period with which my discussion is to deal commences with the beginning of the Christian religious movement and ends with the period of the Crusades, a span of some twelve hundred years of history, marked by the decline of the ancient world and the birth of the modern world. I need not speak, therefore, of the difficulties involved in such a discussion nor of its importance for the understanding of the relationship which, down to our own day, has brought no credit to Christianity and much misfortune to the Jews. All I need say is that I am under the obvious necessity of making the discussion sketchy and omit much of the material which might serve to prove the generalization to which a brief paper must be confined.

The subject falls into three chronological divisions. The end of the first division is marked by the destruction of the Jewish state, a great turning-point in the history of the Jewish people; the end of the second by the emergence of Catholic Christianity armed with secular power and placed in a position to enforce its will; the third period covers the appearance in Western Europe of certain external forces, non-religious in their nature, which made the enforcement of the Church's attitude not only potential but actual.

During the first period, while the Jewish state was still in existence, there is no convincing evidence that any real antagonism existed on the part of the Christians to Jews and Judaism. There was, however, some measure of antagonism on the part of the Jews to Christianity. Neither Jesus nor Paul nor their immediate disciples wished to see the Jewish people degraded and destroyed. With regard to Jesus, present-day studies of the synoptic Gospels seem to indicate that his preaching was motivated by quite the contrary of antagonism towards Jews and Judaism. Not dislike for the Jews nor a desire to reject Judaism but rather faith in the

divine call of the people and a desire to extend and deepen the ethical implications of Judaism, forced Jesus to criticize hypocrisy, speak against burdensome legislation and try to abolish whatever marred the beauty of the Temple worship. Not in hatred but in love for Judaism was Christianity born.

It is equally clear that the first generation of Christians was not antagonistic to Jews. They were themselves considered pious Jews. They frequented the Temple and even fought to have the new faith limited to Jews or, what amounted to the same thing, to such gentiles as adopted a thoroughgoing observance of Judaism. When they finally consented to admit gentiles into the fellowship of believers in the resurrected Messiah they did so on the same basis as Jews were at that time admitting gentiles into the category of "those who feared the Lord." Such gentiles were to abstain from the grosser vices of paganism and were to be considered candidates for eventual absorption into the fellowship of those who observed the entire ceremonial. The Jewish Christians completely broke with Paul when they discovered that he was making no distinction between gentile and Jew. It is usually pointed out that the beginnings of a change in their attitude may be seen in their refusal to take part in the national uprising against Rome. But while it is true that by this time a second generation of converts was in the ascendant and the influence of gentile Christians felt, nevertheless, the withdrawal of the Judeo-Christians from Jerusalem may just as well have been due to the same spirit of non-nationalism which at that very time prevailed in many other circles among the Jews in Palestine and, especially, outside of Palestine. For there is good reason to believe that the majority of the Christians of that age were Jews from the Hellenistic diaspora rather than Palestinians, and at this time the diaspora Jews were lukewarm toward the nationalist strivings of Judea.

The attitude of Paul, while not so clear, nevertheless reveals no evidence of hostility to Jews. To be sure, he had harsh words for "the Law" and its efficacy for salvation, statements which were destined to cause trouble, yet he called the Law "holy, just and good," and he proudly admitted his descent from the Jewish people. In fact, he so broadened the term "Jew" as to include in it, as an honorable fellowship, all those who transformed their life by being faithful Christians. Nowhere did he suggest that the Jewish state should be destroyed or that Christians should be unfriendly to Jews. Christianity was to be above nationalism. It is fairly safe to

say that if Paul's attitude had continued to predominate in Christian circles there would have been no anti-Jewishness in the Church.

If there was any antagonism at that time, it showed itself among the Jews toward the Christians. It was not, however, against Christianity as such nor against Christians, gentile or Jewish, that such antagonism was displayed, but rather against people who violated one or another of the institutions considered sacred in Jewish life. It is useless to be drawn here into an argument concerning the execution of Jesus; to excuse, commend, or regret it. The story as the New Testament tells it, and there is no other source, is too confused and shows too many signs of having been told to suit a later generation. What is certain is that Jesus did not die because he was a Christian. Subsequent examples of Jewish hostility are more to the point although even there the story told in the Book of Acts offers too little material of a credible nature to make possible any definite conclusions. In the examples of violence done to Christians those chiefly to blame are the upper classes, those who feared for the *status quo*. The mass of the people was neither hostile nor well-disposed. Rather it was both, depending upon the mass emotion of the moment. The most important persecution was led by the impassioned orator Paul, while on another occasion harm to a Christian was discouraged by the leading Pharisee, Gamaliel. It is also noteworthy that in practically every instance the anger of the Jews was aroused not by the belief in Jesus as the resurrected Messiah as much as by some definite statement of a leader of the Christians which was interpreted as blasphemy. There is still another noteworthy angle to these examples of hostility, namely, that most of them emanated from diaspora Jews and were directed against diaspora Jews. It is therefore necessary to consider the problem of the Jews in the diaspora.

For generations, if not centuries, before the rise of Christianity, the Jews of the diaspora had been carrying on propaganda in favor of Judaism. Not only their arguments but their very manner of living, by its obvious moral superiority to that of pagans, gained for them many adherents and even more sympathizers. Even if the actual number of converts to Judaism was not as great as some suppose, the Jews did succeed in impressing the pagans with the dignity of their faith and with their claims of being the favored people of a mighty God. Before the Jewish state was destroyed there seems to have been a widespread feeling in the East that a great redeemer would come out of Judea. In any event,

there existed a deep understanding of the possibility of making Judaism a cosmopolitan religion and a great desire to bring this to pass. This is what probably accounts for the psychological transformation of Paul. Most diaspora Jews shared his anxiety to bring to the gentile world the fundamental morality and ethics of Judaism. What they refused to give up was the uniqueness of Israel in the scheme of salvation. Not through belief in one man, even though that man happened to be a Jew, was redemption possible, but through faith in a religious society. That is why the Jews of Judea, living as a compact group and fully confident of the continuity of their group, were not the first to attack Stephen. He was a diaspora Jew and so were those who attacked him for placing Jesus higher than the Temple. That is why Paul led the first persecution of the Christians, during which the diaspora Jews were made to scatter from Jerusalem while the native Judeans were allowed to remain. That, too, is why Paul later found so much opposition in the diaspora. The persecution of the Christians by the Jews is thus seen to have been sporadic and merely defensive. Nor did it last for any length of time.

The destruction of the Jewish state in 70 C.E. had two results. One was that the Jewish people lost prestige in the pagan world so that proselytization became more difficult. The other result was that the Jews became more preoccupied with themselves. Their chief problem was now one of self-preservation. This they tried to achieve by several new and disastrous revolts against Roman authority and by placing greater emphasis than ever upon the laws and traditions of the group. It was during this period that the rabbis bent their efforts to create internal unity and this meant the ejection from the Jewish fold of all who subscribed to Christian ideas. They forbade the reading of the many biographies of Jesus then current among the masses of the Jews in Palestine and introduced into the public worship a prayer against sectaries. By the year 135 the process of ejecting the new sect from participation in Jewish life was complete and antagonism to Christianity took on a different color.

In the meantime, between the year 70 and 135, the Christians were undergoing a radical transformation which laid the foundations for their attitude toward the Jews thereafter. Christianity became a definitely gentile movement. The date when that happened is still a moot question. The fact that seemingly earlier portions of the New Testament are clearly marked with the gentile, or rather anti-Jewish point of view, is no proof



that that point of view prevailed in Christian circles during this early period. It has been pointed out that the Gospels and the Book of Acts are not history but propaganda for Christianity. These particular books were chosen from a large number of similar books and, very likely, from different versions of the same books. They therefore indicate more about the attitude of the generation which adopted them into the Christian canon than about the generation during which they were presumably written down. All one can say is that by the year 100, when the Gospel of John was written, there is already evident an unmistakable tendency in Christian circles toward dislike of the Jewish people. By the year 140, when Justin had his colloquy with Trypho, there was a definite movement toward the exclusion from Christian circles of the same Judeo-Christians whom the Jewish people had excluded from their own ranks. Salvation through a religious society was opposed, and even Paul's theory of the intimate relationship between faith in Jesus and moral regeneration was made far subordinate to individual salvation through the resurrected Christ. Judaism and Christianity now became two distinct religions and anti-Jewishness became a matter of Christian policy.

It is important to emphasize that this anti-Jewish policy did not develop in retaliation for the anti-Christian feeling among the Jews, since the comparatively mild persecution in which the Jews had indulged had never been directed against gentile Christians. The real reasons for this policy were more basic to the development of the new religion. Judaism was already then an ancient religion, possessed of a great literature, with great heroes and wise men in its past, and a divine promise of an even more glorious future. Christianity possessed none of these. From the very outset, therefore, the Christians laid claim to the Bible, at first merely as predicting Jesus and later as being exclusively their own. It seems likely that one of the first writings of the Christians was a collection of Old Testament passages which were supposed to refer to the story of Jesus. Within a comparatively short time, as allegorical explanations in the Christian sense became extended to even greater portions of Biblical literature, the entire collection was declared to have been meant for the Christians. Jewish eyes, which did not see in the Bible what the Christians saw in it, were said to be covered by a veil which prevented them from perceiving the true interpretation of the sacred books. Within several generations the Christians also laid claim to being the true Israel, the one to whom God's promise really referred. Now the least that such claims

called for was proof that physical Israel had been rejected. Hence followed the loading upon the shoulders of the Jews of all that was wicked; hence the extension to all the Jews and the exaggeration of the evils with which Jesus had charged some of them and the placing upon them of the guilt for his execution. Moreover, in the misfortunes of the Jewish people, in the dissolution of the state and in subsequent Jewish defeats, the Christians found definite confirmation of their belief that God was displeased with the Jews and no longer wanted the continuance of the people.

These theological causes are not the only ones, however, to account for the anti-Jewishness of the early Church Fathers. It seems unhistorical to argue that the dislike of the Jews which had displayed itself among the pagans in Egypt and Western Asia did not carry over into the circles of gentile Christianity. On the contrary, Christianity could profit from this dislike. For, whereas Judaism in its efforts at proselytization had to overcome this feeling among the pagans, Christianity afforded an additional excuse for indulging it. Christianity enabled the Jew-hating pagan to deny Jewish pretensions and to turn the Scriptures, which the Jews had used so effectively against the gentiles, against the Jews themselves. It is significant that these early heretical movements within Christianity which erred on the side of paganism were rabidly anti-Jewish. Marcionism and Gnosticism, for example, rejected the Old Testament completely and scoffed at the God of the Jews. It was, therefore, not so much pro-Romanism which accounted for the exoneration of Rome from the guilt involved in the execution of Jesus but "pro-gentilism." The very adoption of the New Testament has been laid to a fear lest sole reliance upon the Old Testament give too much prominence to the Jews.

From what has already been said, it should be clear that anti-Jewishness early became a necessary element in Christian theology. In the succeeding few centuries this necessity was by no means obviated, since the Jews were not yet as timid as they became later and did not hesitate to defend their position and carry the theological attack into Christianity itself. That the Jews were really actively in alliance with the pagans during the Roman persecution of the Christians is a matter open to doubt. But that the Jews were not sorry to see these persecutions may be assumed even though Jewish sources are silent about it. It is clear that as Christianity became an increasing menace to Roman paganism the pagans saw no menace in Judaism and treated the Jews with a degree of consideration which con-

trusted sharply with their attitude toward Christians.

Moreover, the Jews continued to be the rivals of the Christians for converts from paganism. This was not so much the case in Palestine, where the Jews were poor and depressed because of economic and political misfortune. It was so, however, in the diaspora, where the situation of the Jews had taken a distinct turn for the better, perhaps for the very reason that they were no longer considered dangerous rivals in any field. The numerous disputations between Jews and Christians of which the Church speaks bear witness to the feeling of the Jews that they had not been defeated. Nor did the Jews hesitate to offer a version of their own of the birth and personality of Jesus, a version which was by no means flattering to the founder of the Christian faith. The existence of a danger to Christianity from the position and influence of the Jews is indicated above all in the legislation of the Church councils during the early centuries of the Christian era. There one may see the great desire of the Christians to have their adherents break all relations with the Jews. Judging by what these councils forbade, it would seem that the leaders of the Church were not finding it so easy to convince their followers that the Jewish people had been rejected and that the Old Testament is to be read allegorically and not literally. Many Christians observed the Jewish Sabbath, ate *mazzot* on the Jewish Passover and frequented the synagogue. The entire situation caused a redoubling of the efforts made by the Church Fathers against the Jews. There was hardly a reference to the Jews which was not qualified with a disparaging statement. They were described as adoring not God but angels; Judaism was called "a sad and cold religion"; Jews were lazy; they were atheists; they were misanthropic, useless, seditious, obstinate, bold, cowards, sensual, greedy, a nation of slaves, and so on and on. It is noteworthy that many of these characterizations were taken over from ancient pagan authors.

One result of the situation at this time deserves particular attention. Clannishness has been a favorite charge against the Jews down to the present day. If it means anything at all it is a repetition of the ancient accusation that Jewish law makes it impossible for the Jew to have intimate social relationship with gentiles. As we have just seen, this was not the case in ancient times. The admission of God-fearing pagans and Christians to the synagogues, the fact that Christians had to be discouraged from going to Jewish homes to eat and from associating with them in other ways, would seem to prove that not the Jews, but the Christians were ex-

clusive. To be sure, the Jews would not eat at the home of a gentile or drink wine which a gentile had touched. What is frequently overlooked, however, is that the early Christians had regulations to practically the same effect with regard to pagans who used to begin their meals with a libation, so that Christians too were accused of being misanthropic and unsocial. With respect to the Jews, it was the Church that broke off social ties and after the pagans had disappeared it looked as though the Jews were the only ones who remained a group apart.

By the fourth century the ultimate triumph of the Church in pagan society was fairly well assured. By the second quarter of the century its triumph over the imperial power was achieved. But its internal struggles for theological unity were by no means over. The bitter dispute between the Arians and the Athanasians were to dominate that century and extend for several centuries longer. It marked the last struggle between paganism and the monotheism which orthodox Christianity attained. From the point of view of the Jews, the dispute was important because the Jews seemed to have hoped for the triumph of Arius, and because throughout the existence of the Arian heresy the peoples who adhered to it were favorably disposed to the Jews. Why they sympathized with Arius is rather obscure. Nor is it clear how the Jews could have aided the Arian cause, unless it was through intrigue on the part of a few influential Jews who had access to the palace. The fact is, however, that the Jews came to be numbered among the persecutors of Athanasius. As time went on this was exaggerated and combined with similarly exaggerated stories of Jewish participation in the persecution of Christians and the fostering of heresy in the Church. For there had been, and there continued to be other heresies of the Judaizing kind, whose adherents were not so hostile to Judaism as was expected of an orthodox believer. Perhaps the real explanation for this sympathy, as of the greater favor subsequently shown by the Arian barbarian peoples, lies in the natural affinity of minority groups. The net effect, however, upon the Catholic Church was to make it axiomatic that Judaism was a great and dangerous enemy, open when it dared to be, secret when it could be, quiescent when no opportunity offered itself and when the Church had the upper hand.

The favor shown to the Jews by Julian the Apostate served to strengthen this belief among the Christians. Subsequent Church historians never tired of pointing out the close alliance between Julian and the Jews and the joy of the Jews at the prospect of having the Temple rebuilt with the

huge sums which they collected for the purpose. The exaggerations in these tales were obviously intended for the purpose of making the victory of the Church more outstanding and the miracle more impressive. The stories took hold, however, and further force was given to the identification of the Jews with the enemy of the Church by the constant repetition of this charge by the Church Fathers. We may cite the case of Chrysostom as an example. No one attacked the Jews more bitterly than did the great orator, Chrysostom. The relations between Jews and Christians in Antioch, even as late as the second half of the fourth century, were as described above. The Christians of Antioch did not hate the Jews; they maintained social relations with them and considered the synagogue a particularly sacred place in which to take an oath. Against such a state of affairs Chrysostom felt obliged to use his golden mouth. Orators have always been a plague to the Jewish people. Exaggeration and generalization are of the very essence of oratory. When heard, the effects of such statements are sometimes mitigated by facts known to the audience. They become more dangerous when written down and read by a later generation. Thus Chrysostom's influence upon later ages was even greater than upon his own. He was read and quoted. His exaggerations and similes became not only facts but articles of faith.

Thus the whole gamut of accusations made in the heat of conflict during the early period of Christianity became fixed through constant repetition on the part of people who could have had but scant acquaintance with Jews. Let us take one such accusation and trace its development. In the Gospel of John (8.44) Jesus is made to say to the Jews: "Ye are of your father the devil." This is obviously a metaphorical phrase. But it was often repeated, and through Jerome, Athanasius, Ambrose, and sometime later Amulo of Lyons, it is possible to trace the development of the idea into that of temptation by the devil (who was a real personality all through the ages), partnership with the devil, and finally willing slaves and instruments of the devil. When, therefore, during the Crusading age and later a Christian wanted to strike a blow at the devil, he could obviously do so by striking at a Jew.

What I have tried to point out so far is that by the time Christianity became the dominant religion of the Empire, the foundation for its attitude toward the Jews was already laid. This attitude, moreover, was the natural outcome of theological necessity and of defense against the danger of a relapse into Judaism. It was an inevitable by-product of Christian

propaganda, which had to assume that Judaism was dead while Judaism refused to die. The Christian Church never recognized that Judaism was a different religion; it saw Judaism as a distortion of the only true religion, a *perfidia*, a stubborn rebelliousness against God. The very term "Jew" assumed a new and evil connotation. Whereas in the first century the founders of Christianity claimed that name for themselves, in the fifth century it was already an insulting term, for which, in pleasanter moments, the term "Hebrew" was substituted.

Later ages merely solidified the attitude and tried to apply it, sometimes with more and at other times with less success. What I should like to point out now is that this success or failure depended not so much upon the zeal of the clergy of the day, although that too was a factor of no mean significance, as upon the nature of the ruler, the state of the land he ruled and the economic position of the Jews. For, although in theory, as developed especially by Augustine, the Church claimed superiority over the state, in practise such superiority was exercised during but a few brief periods in the history of Christianity. Certainly till the definite establishment of the supremacy of the bishop of Rome, the emperors at Constantinople used the Church rather than permitted themselves to be its instruments. It is quite clear, as Juster points out, that the hand of the bishops began to guide the pen of the emperors at once after the triumph of Christianity. But it must be admitted that occasionally the hand was shaken off. Ambrose successfully defended the destruction of synagogues; the code of Theodosius set the example for the degradation of the Jews; the influence of the clergy obtained the discontinuance of the patriarchate in Palestine; Cyril of Alexandria, who called the Jews a vicious lot, organized pogroms so efficient as to destroy the Jewish community of Egypt and went unpunished. Nevertheless, it is equally significant that there were still Jews left in the Eastern Roman empire, that they had permission to live in accordance with their own civil law, that Judaism continued to be a religion permitted to its adherents and the synagogues were protected and conversion to Christianity made rather difficult. What explains this dual policy? In the first place, Roman law had something of the sacred about it; emperors did not willingly break with the past. They might modify the old status or withhold certain privileges but the basic ideas which made the empire continuous were not destroyed. The basic right of Judaism to exist was not tampered with. Secondly, the Jews of that day, especially where they were to be found in any numbers, were far from being a pacifist group. Especially in the East, where they could join hands

with the Persians, the emperors did not dare to make their life too difficult. Besides, not all the emperors needed, nor did all of them seek the co-operation of the clergy in bringing about greater unity within the empire. Finally, the Jews were still an economic class of some importance. Some of them owned ships which sailed the Mediterranean; they engaged in import and export, and on occasion they could make themselves heard at the imperial court.

There was still another theory developed by the Church to which some of the credit for the survival of the Jews has been attributed. This theory is based on the Biblical statement that Israel is indestructible. The statements to this effect were emphasized by Paul, who interpreted them in the sense that a saving remnant would come to recognize Jesus. From this the Church subsequently drew the conclusion that the Jewish people must not be completely destroyed. The world needs them for a double purpose: to prove by their very existence that the story told in the Bible was true, and to prove by their ultimate conversion the actual triumph of the Church. In the meantime, they were to wander over the face of the earth, even as Cain wandered in punishment for slaying his brother. Augustine worked out the formula in this fashion. "Cain was not killed," he exclaimed, "but was cursed through the land which swallowed the blood of his brother." Cain, he proceeds to explain, is the Jewish people, and the land through which he is cursed is the Christian Church. One corollary of all this was that the Jews must not be terrorized into accepting Christianity but must be led to see the light. In later years, great churchmen certainly invoked this principle to defend the Jews. Notable among these were Gregory the Great, at the end of the sixth century, and Bernard of Clairvaux, during the second Crusade. But there were innumerable other churchmen who seem to have felt that a smaller remnant would suffice. In general, one cannot escape the feeling that the fact of Jewish survival gave rise to the theory, rather than that the theory of the "remnant to be saved" was the cause of Jewish survival. This principle, however, had another corollary, namely, that if the Jews are to live as a proof and an example, they must not enjoy their life. No power was to be entrusted to them lest they corrupt the Christian world. Misery and misfortune was to be their lot as becomes subjects who rebelled against their Lord.

The rest of the period under discussion affords illustrative material of the working out of Church theories in a world which was willing to accept the personal salvation offered by the Church but not often the social implications of Christianity. We turn to Spain. One first hears of the relations

between the Jews and Christians of that land through conciliar decrees which forbid social intercourse with Jews. The success of such decrees was scant. For centuries the Jews lived in peace in the land, both under Roman rule and under that of the Visigoths. Toward the end of the sixth century, however, the Visigothic king became a Catholic and the situation for the Jews changed at once. During a little more than a century the laws against the Jews and Judaism became increasingly severe until conversion or death were the only alternatives. The only reason that the Jews survived even this century was the fact that not all of the kings showed equal zeal. The entire situation is explainable on the basis of the internal political conditions of the Visigothic state and the economic power of the Jews. Had not most of the kings of this century sought to strengthen their own position at the expense of that of the Visigothic nobility they would not have sought the alliance of the Catholic Church to which the majority of the population belonged. This union of Church and state was sealed under promise of the state to carry on the Church's war against the Jews. But the Jews were socially and economically a fairly strong group. The weight of their influence was thrown on the side of the forces of decentralization and this enabled them to survive for several generations. But it is not likely that they would have survived much longer against the powerful combination of Church and state. The arrival of the Moslems gave them a new lease on life.

The other examples of how the Church's attitude was realized through external factors lies in the history of the Frankish empire and its successors. In Gaul, as in Spain, the need for defending Christianity against the lure which Judaism had for many sections of the population led to any number of conciliar expressions which urged the need for social separation between Jews and Christians. The Church theory of Jewish inferiority was evidently far from a reality. Under King Dagobert, to be sure, there was a moment when the Church had sufficient personal influence with the king to bring about an expulsion of the Jews in 629. Just how widespread this expulsion was has not yet been made clear. For a century and a half the Jews are not heard of in the Frankish kingdom. But they appear again in the days of Charlemagne none the worse for the previous event. There is a moment during the ninth century when we get a clear view of them and their position. Lyons was one of the most prominent and commercially most prosperous sections of Europe of that day. Its bishop around 830 was Agobard, an earnest and zealous churchman, well-read in the writings of the Fathers. He sensed danger



in the relations between his flock and the Jews of the city. For not only were the Jews not in the inferior status to which the theory of the Church assigned them; they were the most important merchants, both local and international, they attracted the society of Christians and their religion was looked upon with respect. Agobard tried to destroy their influence. He brought charges against them before King Louis the Pious but lost his case. The king protected the Jews and their life went on unhindered.

It was not until the twelfth century, in the age of the Crusades, that a definite situation arose which indicated to what extent the mind of the Christians had changed with regard to the Jews. It is not the physical attacks upon them to which attention need be drawn; these can be explained on the basis of the greed of the unorganized hordes and the impassioned oratory of ambitious leaders. The important element in the situation is that during this period began the process of the definite relegation of the Jews to an inferior social and political status. This was the age when the charges of usury, desecration of the host, and ritual murder began to be levelled against them and used as excuses for local attacks. Their position became insecure, so that they more or less acquiesced in the new status of being the personal property of the local prince, the king, or the emperor. By the end of the twelfth century, the entire calendar of Church theories with regard to the Jews obtained practical reality. The fourth Lateran Council drew the logical conclusions from these theories and the existing state of affairs when it marked the Jews as social outcasts by branding them with the Jewish badge. Total expulsion from various countries and expulsion from society, i.e., the ghetto, were but a single step beyond this.

What accounts for the tremendous difference between the days of Agobard and those of Innocent III? The answer does not lie solely in the Church and its theology. The Church, to be sure, had become better organized; it had gained in learning and prestige. But any real need on its part further to combat Judaism no longer existed. The Jews did stand out in the midst of a Catholic population and thereby proved the possibility of another faith. I am inclined to doubt, however, that they any longer had any such influence on the growth of heretical Christian movements as we are sometimes inclined to assume. The vast majority of Christians had become quite persuaded of the inferiority of Judaism. The Church, especially the lower clergy, continued to hammer away at the subject, not because of theological necessity but because it was a popular thing to do, and profitable both financially and politically.

Another difference between the ninth and the thirteenth centuries which aggravated the position of the Jew lies in the fact that racial unification in the various lands of Europe was now complete. From this unity the Jews had excluded themselves by refusing to become Christians. They were thus a marked group, welcome only when their social usefulness was obvious but blamed for every conceivable and inconceivable ill as soon as their usefulness was no longer obvious.

It is in this question of the social usefulness of the Jews, or rather the obviousness of that usefulness, that the basic reason, although not the only reason, must be sought for the change in the Jewish status. In the ninth century the Jews were the outstanding commercial class and, therefore, socially indispensable. By the end of the early Middle Ages a Christian merchant class had taken the place of the Jews. To the extent to which Jews were still merchants, they were the competitors of Christians who could claim that an alien and theologically damned race was uselessly duplicating their efforts. Because of this and other reasons, the Jews had in the meantime entered the business of moneylending. But, unfortunately, some centuries were yet to pass before the social usefulness of this business would be universally recognized. In the meantime, it merely served to arouse against the Jews the natural dislike of the debtor for the creditor, and to stir the greed of all classes including the kings for the wealth which the Jews were supposed to have. Thus the Jewish group seemed alien in spite of its having lived for centuries in many of the countries involved; it seemed economically unnecessary in spite of the fact that it had contributed and was still contributing to the economic development of Western Europe, and, undefended because of the still inadequate powers of the central government, it had against it the powerful opposition of the Christian Church.

The last-named opposition lent a certain dignity and virtue to the hatred which all the causes combined to instill. The popes of those ages frequently recognized that Christianity was being misused to cover up the greed and violence from which the Jews had to suffer. But the voices raised in the defense of the Jews were weak compared to the power of official Church theory and local Church practise which made for their degradation. A theology which was no longer necessary, a greed which cloaked itself in piety and mental habits fostered by fanaticism could now revel in their triumph.

## JEWES IN MEDIEVAL ART

By JOSEPH REIDER

It is a well-known fact that art in Middle Ages, like so many other disciplines, was chiefly religious,<sup>1</sup> ancillary and subservient to the all-powerful *ecclesia*, and consequently it reflected the ideas and ideals of the regnant Catholic Church. Now since this Church is known to have been antagonistic and hostile to the Jews, it is not at all surprising that art, its protégé, should have proved anything but sympathetic to them. And indeed we find art playing a very important role in disseminating distorted conceptions and false notions of the Jews, often depicting them in unnatural colors and derogatory poses, sometimes even as frightful monsters without any redeeming virtues. The artists thus helped to fan the bias and hatred of the populace, who knew them for the most part from these misrepresentations and caricatures and not from close personal contact. In an age of rampant ecclesiasticism and furious sacerdotalism, when reason was garrotted and superstition held full sway, it was not unnatural that art should contribute its share in formulating and promulgating the well-known myth of His Satanic Majesty, the medieval Jew.

The artists took their cue, as usual, from the literature of their day, from the popular rhymes and epigrams, the liturgical anthems and hymns, the polemical sermons and addresses, the miracle and passion plays, all of which were saturated with Judeophobia of the crassest kind.<sup>2</sup> In keeping with the custom of those days, when graphic arts were still of a narrative and expository character, they even appended some of these abusive texts in the form of streamers as a commentary to their already offensive crea-

<sup>1</sup> Even when the sensitive artists felt like indulging their imagination in secular and unholy subjects, such as robust nudes of creamy coloration and velvety skin, they flaunted them on their canvases in the form of holy Biblical characters. Witness the saints of Fra Angelico, the Cherubs of Correggio, the Madonnas of Raphael, the Sibyls of Michelangelo, etc.

<sup>2</sup> See Weber, Paul, *Geistliches Schauspiel und kirchliche Kunst* (Stuttgart 1894) p. 24 ff.; Mâle, Émile, *L'Art religieux du XIIe siècle en France* (Paris 1922) p. 121 ff. Comp. also Pflaum, Heinz, "Les Scènes de Juifs dans la littérature dramatique du Moyen-Âge," in *Revue des Études Juives*, vol. lxxxix (1930) 111-34; Strumpf, D., *Die Juden in der mittelalterlichen Mysterien- Mirakel- und Moralitätenliteratur Frankreichs* (Heidelberg 1920). For a general discussion see Chambers, E. K., *The Mediaeval Stage* (Oxford 1903) vol. ii, p. 1-67. It is significant that passion plays were stopped in Rome in 1539 because after each performance the populace sacked the Jewish quarter there; see Vatasso, Marco, *Per la Storia del Dramma Sacro in Italia* (Rome 1903).

tions. The work of chisel and brush was not sufficient to vilify the dreaded enemy, so the pen too was called into action. This furious and concerted attack endured to the close of the medieval period, and even became intensified through the invention of printing in the middle of the fifteenth century.

One of the most powerful motifs of this controversial medieval art was the juxtaposition of the Church and the Synagogue in the form of two female figures, one glorious and victorious, the other downcast and depressed. The figure symbolizing the Christian Church generally wears a crown, holds in one hand a chalice, the pledge of communion with her Lord, and in the other hand a cross, the symbol of her faith and power. The figure symbolizing the Synagogue is in mourning garb and blinded, a veil being over her eyes; the crown fallen from her head, she bears in one hand the tables of the Law, in the other a drooping banner on a broken staff. Sometimes the tables of the Law lie scattered at her feet. In one instance, at Saint-Denis on the Seine, which is famed for its stained glass windows, Jesus is pictured standing between the Church and the Synagogue, crowning with his right hand the former while tearing off with his left the veil which covers the face of the latter. A Latin verse explains the medallion thus: *quod Moyses velat Christi doctrina revelat*, "what Moses covers with a veil is revealed by the teaching of Christ." This is but a rephrasing of St. Augustine's famous dictum, "the Old Testament is nothing but the New covered with a veil and the New Testament is nothing but the Old revealed" (*Civitas Dei*, XVI, 26). In another instance, on a window of the famous Bourges cathedral, the Church, crowned, stands on the right of crucified Jesus and receives in a chalice the blood trickling from his open wound, while the Synagogue, blinded, stands on the left and lets the crown fall off her head and the tables of the Law from her hands. This motif, which cropped up first in the ninth and continued until the sixteenth century throughout Central Europe, has been definitely traced to the early Christian liturgy and sermon and to the somewhat later mystery play.<sup>8</sup> It is based on the common disputation between the Church and the Synagogue in the early days of Christianity, when the argument of superiority and inferiority

<sup>8</sup> See Weber, *op. cit.*, where all the information on this subject has been collected very diligently and with a certain degree of finality. See also Mâle, *op. cit.*, p. 166, and *L'Art religieux du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle en France* (Paris 1902) p. 225; further Hildenfänger, P., "La Figure de la synagogue dans l'art du Moyen Âge," in *Revue des Études Juives*, vol. xlvii (1908) 187 ff.; Singer, Charles, "Allegorical Representation of the Synagogue in a Twelfth-Century Illumi-

was thrust back and forth with great acerbity and its echo resounded in pulpit and prayer book. The first disputation of this sort between the Church and the Synagogue is found in a Syriac hymn in the form of a dialogue, the author of which is perhaps St. Ephraim (306-378).<sup>4</sup> In Europe this disputation was introduced through a pamphlet entitled *De altercatione Ecclesiae et Synagogae dialogus*, ascribed to St. Augustine but probably composed by someone else.<sup>5</sup> Side by side with this dialogue, a sermon was current under the title *Sermo beati Augustini contra Paganos, Judaeos et Arianos de Symbolo*, which had the same polemic character as the dialogue and was likewise a pseudograph. In addition to these there were abundant abusive verses in the hymns of the Church Fathers, such as St. Ambrose (340-397), Aurelius Clemens Prudentius (348-410), Venantius Fortunatus (530-609) and others. The kernel of the underlying thought, however, is found already in the Biblical book of Lamentations, which depicts the great affliction and dire distress of Jerusalem after her destruction at the hands of Nebuchadnezzar in 586 B.C.E. "How doth the city sit solitary, that was full of people! How is she become as a widow! She that was great among the nations, and princess among the provinces, how is she become tributary!" (1.1); "Jerusalem hath grievously sinned, therefore she is become as one unclean . . . she herself also sigheth, and turneth backward" (1.8); "The crown is fallen from our head; woe unto us! for we have sinned" (5.16); "What shall I liken to thee, o daughter of Jerusalem? . . . for thy breach is great like the sea; who can heal thee?" (2.13). These few verses alone, and there are many more like them in the book of Lamentations, already contain the germs of the figure of the Synagogue in the group under discussion. As to the Church, she actually was at the peak of her triumph and the zenith of her glory, hence she was rightfully panoplied in coruscating garb and defiant splendor, looking down nonchalantly or insolently on her hapless rival.

This figure seems to have been popular and quite universal, for it has been located on the portals of cathedrals and town halls in many cities

nated Ms. of Hildegard of Bingen," in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, n. s., vol. v (1915) 267 ff. In the latter the synagogue is pictured as a blind and downcast woman holding in her lap Abraham and the prophets and on her breasts Moses with a blue conical cap that was a characteristic mark of the German Jews during the later Middle Ages.

<sup>4</sup> Kirschner, B., "Alphabetische Akrosticha in der syrischen Kirchenpoesie," in *Oriens Christianus*, vol. vi (1907) 29-49.

<sup>5</sup> See Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, vol. xlii, col. 1131-1140.

of France and Germany, such as Paris, Bordeaux, Strasbourg, Bamberg, Worms, etc. It is known to have existed in many more localities, from which it disappeared in the course of reconstruction in modern times. Originally confined to the plastic arts and used as statues on cathedrals and city halls, it came to be employed in the course of time also in the graphic and minor arts, as paintings on church windows, illustrations of hymnals and other books, woodcuts and carvings on ivory, weaving designs in textiles, etc. In the pre-printing age this delineation through the plastic and graphic arts was equivalent to proclamation through broadsides in the fifteenth and subsequent centuries and to publication in newspapers in modern times; like these it helped to create and formulate public opinion.

Another popular motif of medieval art, infinitely more offensive and reaching the acme of obscenity, was the delineation of Judaism in the form of a sow.<sup>6</sup> This caricature, designed with special spite and malice since it was commonly known that the pig was forbidden to Jews, was conceived in Germany some time during the thirteenth century and spread to neighboring lands in subsequent centuries. Its earliest appearance was on the Cathedral of Magdeburg at the close of the thirteenth century; next we meet with it at Regensburg in the fourteenth century, at Freising and on the church of Wittenberg<sup>7</sup> at the beginning of the fifteenth century and similarly on many cathedrals and churches of other cities in Germany.<sup>8</sup> In Frankfurt-am-Main it made its appearance even on the bridge spanning the river. From German churches this sculptured figure travelled also to French and Flemish churches. The graphic arts perpetuated this caricature in the fifteenth century through various broadsides, which were furthered through the invention of printing. In one form or another it lingered on until the nineteenth century, when it was finally banished by the spirit of enlightenment. But one should not be surprised if reactionaries of today should revive it once more.

As pointed out above, this caricature was ubiquitous in medieval Germany, but most famous of all was the sow of Wittenberg, probably

<sup>6</sup> See Otte, *Handbuch der kirchlichen Kunstarchäologie*, vol. i, ed. 5, p. 488; see also Kaufmann, David, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. i, p. 161 ff.

<sup>7</sup> The first description of the sow of Wittenberg was given by Luther in his pamphlet *Vom Schem Hamephoras*, which appeared in 1543 together with his *Von den Juden und ihren Lügen*. A later description is found in *De Schemhamphorasch usu et abusu* by Laurentius Fabricius, which was published in 1596; cf. further *Revue des Études Juives*, vol. xix (1889) 239.

<sup>8</sup> For another description of the "Jewish sow" see Altmann, *Geschichte der Juden in Salzburg*, vol. i, p. 163.

because Luther has left us a description of it in his diatribe against the Jews.<sup>9</sup> He states as follows: "Here in Wittenberg a sow is chiselled in stone at the church and under her lie suckling pigs and Jews sucking from her teats; behind the sow stands a rabbi who raises her tail and bends down and looks attentively beneath it into the Talmud, as if he wanted to read something special and ingenious, probably there is the place of their Shemhamphoras. . . ." This was by no means the worst representation of this motif; there were many more vicious representations. In addition to the customary features described by Luther, we find on many broadsides that the sow is swallowing excrement and the distorted Jew in the back is imbibing it in turn as it comes forth beneath her tail.<sup>10</sup> In this way the stubborn Synagogue was made a butt for coarse wit and the people's taste for vulgarity and obscenity was satisfied.

As might have been expected, this offensive piece of sculpture was usually turned towards the ghetto, so that Jews emerging therefrom could not avoid beholding it and being stung to the quick. Fortunately the irony of history willed it that the sharp edge was removed from this caricature through the circumstance that in medieval Jewish symbolism the sow represented Rome and its Catholic hierarchy, and whenever a Jew passed this monstrous sculpture on cathedrals and churches it signified to him the castigation of converted and recalcitrant Jews who hung on to the breasts of Rome.<sup>11</sup>

So much for the presentation of Judaism and the Synagogue in the art of the Middle Ages. As to the Jew himself, he hardly fared much better at the hands of the biased artists. From the very beginning of European art in the early Christian centuries a ridiculous type was created to represent the Jew, generally a gnarled and decrepit being with sharply pointed and well-accentuated features, weak-kneed and woe-begone, with a pointed, dishevelled beard, clad in a loose gaberdine and some sort of a round cap. In the later Middle Ages, beginning with the twelfth century, the conical or funnel-shaped hat<sup>12</sup> and the yellow

<sup>9</sup> Cf. note 7.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Fuchs, Eduard, *Die Juden in der Karikatur*, p. 9 and double-page illustration facing it.

<sup>11</sup> See Kaufmann, David, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. i, p. 166. Johannes Christian Wagenseil, in his *De infundibuli sui occasione, consilio et instituto* (1693), p. 71, relates that a Christian painter once told him how, when engaged to paint the frescoes in a synagogue, he took the liberty to paint the sow of Wittenberg inside the holy ark.

<sup>12</sup> The *Judenhut* was conical and pointed at the top, and the brim was often twisted into the form of a pair of horns (Weiss, *Kostümkunde*, p. 147). It was generally yellow and served as a distinguishing mark in accordance with the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215).

badge<sup>18</sup> were added to this type. This satirical figure, modelled after the controversial literature of those days, was intended to arouse aversion and disgust in the people beholding it, especially when juxtaposed with the lusty and robust Christian type. To make sure of its wide distribution and universal propagation it was not only sculptured inside and outside of churches and cathedrals but also graphically illuminated in Bibles, prayer books and hymnals used at home. For, curiously enough, this type was applied to Old Testament characters and Biblical patriarchs, prophets, kings and poets were often pictured in the dejected posture and unsavory garb of medieval Jews. This may not be evident in the early products of this art, such as in the Biblical cycles presented on the mosaics of the churches Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome, Cappella Palatina in Palermo, the Cathedral in Monreale in Sicily and St. Mark's in Venice. As a matter of fact it is conspicuous by its absence from the Biblical cycles of Lorenzo Ghiberti on the bronze doors of the Baptistry at Florence, Benozzo Gozzoli in the Campo Santo at Pisa, Raphael on the ceilings of the Loggie of the Vatican and Michelangelo on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel of the Vatican. Apparently Mediterranean artists were not as susceptible to this motif as those of northern Europe. But this figure makes its appearance in many Biblical pictures which had their origin in Central Europe, during the Romanesque-Gothic period, more precisely from the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries. A careful perusal of any complete collection of Biblical pictures, such as Theodor Ehrenstein's *Das alte Testament im Bilde* (Vienna 1923), will convince anyone of the truth of this statement. Here we meet with various subjects treated in this manner, such as Jacob's journey to Egypt and his blessing to Joseph (XV, 12 and 19), the exodus from Egypt (XVIII, 20 and 22), the adoration of the brazen serpent (XIX, 34.114-117), the delivery of the Law by Moses (*ibid.*, 61), the worship of the golden calf (*ibid.*, 79 and 81), the spies carrying a huge cluster of grapes (*ibid.*, 101), the fall of Jericho (XX, 32-33), Abner killed by Joab (XXVI, 40), etc. In all these pictures the Biblical characters are modelled after the bespattered and besmirched medieval type of Jew, garbed in the characteristic gaberdine and funnel-shaped hat, with distorted features and in a cringing and crouching attitude. Subsequently this motif crept into

\* The yellow badge was circular and was fixed on the breast, while Jewesses were obliged to bear two blue stripes on their veils or cloaks (Abrahams, *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*, p. 320).



the *Biblia Pauperum* or Poor Man's Bible,<sup>14</sup> which consisted of woodcuts illustrating Biblical history for the visualization of the common people who often could neither read nor write. Such a Bible consisted of either forty or fifty woodcuts, disposed in three horizontal compartments, each being itself arranged in three vertical divisions, all divided from each other by an architectural framework. The chief figure, in the central compartment, was taken from the New Testament and this was complemented by an appropriate illustration on each side from the Old Testament. Above and below the New Testament subject there was a pair of prophets set in the frame of a double window. The rest of the compartments left and right contained a verse or two, greatly condensed and abbreviated, explaining the Biblical subjects next to them. The purpose of this picture series was expressed through the following verse:

*Novus Testamentum in vetere latet,  
Vetus in novo patet*

i.e., every New Testament picture must have on its side one or more Old Testament precedents confirming its veracity. The striking thing here is the contrast in the treatment of the central New Testament and the lateral Old Testament subjects: the former are always handled with great dignity and reverence, with proper seriousness and care, while the latter are often manipulated with flippancy and disparagement, in a derisive and satirical vein. The Old Testament characters are conceived in the same derogatory pose as the familiar medieval Jewish type and are used as pegs on which to suspend the poisonous darts of spiteful wit and malicious satire.

The *Biblia Pauperum* gave rise to many other pictorial Bibles, such as the Moralising Bible, the Historiated Bible, the Allegorical Bible, the Book of Hours, and the *Speculum Humanae Salvationis*, all fine specimens of the flourishing xylographic art and laid out along the lines and designs of its parent.<sup>15</sup> There cannot be any doubt that these anonymous pictorial Bibles, reproduced in considerable number soon after the invention of block printing and widely disseminated among the common people, exercised a potent influence on the mind of the populace and

<sup>14</sup> The *Biblia Pauperum* originated towards the end of the thirteenth century, probably in a Benedictine monastery of Bavaria. Cf. Cornell, Henrik, *Biblia Pauperum* (Stockholm 1925) p. 149 ff.; see also Schreiber, W. L., *Die Entstehung und Entwicklung der Biblia Pauperum* (Strassburg n.d.).

<sup>15</sup> On these derivatives of the *Biblia Pauperum* cf. Mâle, E., *L'Art religieux au fin du Moyen Age en France* (Paris 1922) p. 232 ff.

helped to further the spread of Judeophobia in Central Europe. Since the personal contact between Jew and Christian was very feeble since the fateful days of the Crusades, the unwitting man or woman was only too prone to accept as genuine the adulteries of art and pictorial misrepresentations of their ecclesiastics.

But not only in Biblical pictures was the Jew misrepresented in this way. As a matter of fact the sacred and archaic subjects of the Bible acted in some way as a deterrent to the wild fancy and antipathetical proclivities of the artist. Worse misrepresentations, bordering on the line of caricature, are met with in detached drawings and engravings of a secular character. Here the derogatory features are intensified and the negative traits are exaggerated, as is customary in caricatures: the languid and pallid face becomes more wan and ghastly, the beard becomes more pointed and disheveled, the funnel of the hat grows in size and the gaberdine extends in width and length. There are numerous examples of this type in medieval art, but I can point out only a few. Such are the Jewish figures in an illuminated manuscript of the *Scivias* of Hildegard of Bingen, a product of the twelfth century.<sup>16</sup> A specimen familiar to many is the figure of the minnesinger, Süßkind of Trimberg, in Bavaria in a codex of the thirteenth century in Heidelberg.<sup>17</sup> Another example are the Jewish figures in a block book edition of the Apocalypse of St. John of the fifteenth century.<sup>18</sup> Even in a Latin translation of the Haggadah produced by Thomas Murner in 1512 we find woodcuts of Beatus Murner representing groups of three Jews at the table in various unattractive poses. That it was not foreign to England may be seen from an undated caricature on a Roll containing an account of the tallages and fines paid by Jews to Henry III, presumably in 1233.<sup>19</sup> It is an elaborate satirical design of Jews and devils, arranged on a pediment.

Thus the misrepresentation of the Jew in medieval art was comprehensive and far-reaching. Wherever the Christian turned in his daily life the distorted figure of the Jew was flaunted before his eyes: on portals, frescoes, and stained-glass windows of churches and cathedrals; on monuments and memorials in public squares, city-halls and on bridges; in illuminated and illustrated Bibles, Psalters and prayer books in general,

<sup>16</sup> Cf. the article by Charles Singer in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, n. s., vol. v (1915) 267 ff.

<sup>17</sup> Reproduced by B. Badt in *Die Lieder des Süßkind von Trimberg* (Berlin 1920) and in *Jüdisches Lexikon*, vol. v, plate dx.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Westheim, Paul, *Das Holzschnittbuch* (Postdam 1921) p. 22.

<sup>19</sup> *Exchequer of Receipt, Jews' Roll*, no. 8.

constantly used at home; and besides on many household articles, such as stoves, china plates, and urinals, and *bric-a-brac* on mantelpieces. Add to these the parallel misrepresentations in literature (hymnals, sermons, polemics) and on the stage (miracle and passion plays), and one gets an idea of the far-flung and thorough poisoning of the minds of the people, leading to a deep-seated bias against and profound hatred of the Jews. It helps to explain the violent outbreaks in peaceful communities which often led to bloodshed.

It is interesting to note that this misrepresentation or rather caricaturization of the Jew in medieval European art went on for centuries to such an extent that it almost began to convince the Jews themselves of its supposed truthfulness. At any rate, towards the close of the Middle Ages we meet with books illustrated by Jewish artists in the same derogatory style, perpetuating the legend of an inferior creature. This applies to a miniature of Lot fleeing from Sodom in a miscellaneous Hebrew volume of the close of the thirteenth century in the British Museum,<sup>20</sup> in which Lot is modelled after the despicable medieval Jewish type outlined above. Again, it occurs in an illuminated Bible codex belonging to the Jewish community of Cracow and executed in Germany during the fourteenth century, where Abraham, Moses and their contemporaries are pictured in the ridiculous conical hats of the medieval Jews.<sup>21</sup> This type is found particularly in illuminations and illustrations of the Passover Haggadah which are known to be the work of Jewish artists but must have been derived from a Christian source. Striking specimens may be found in the manuscript Haggadahs found at the Hebrew Union College Library in Cincinnati and at the municipal libraries of Munich and Darmstadt, all dating from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.<sup>22</sup>

The artistic vilification of the Jew went on for centuries and was even carried over into modern times, when caricature developed into a special art. How the Jew fared in this modern caricature is a subject for itself, which can easily be studied with the aid of Eduard Fuchs' *Die Juden in der Karikatur* (Munich 1921). But the medieval spell was broken by

<sup>20</sup> Described by G. Margoliouth in *Catalogue of Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. iii, p. 402 ff.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Ameisenowa, Zofja, *Biblia Hebrajska XIV-go Wieku w Krakowie i jej Dekoracja*, *Malarzka* (Cracow 1929).

<sup>22</sup> For a detailed description of these Haggadahs and their illustrations, cf. *Die Darmstädter Pessach-Haggadah*, ed. by Bruno Italiener (Leipzig 1927).

Rembrandt, who rid himself of an age-long bias, and through a series of noble and patriarchal Jewish figures demonstrated to the world that the Jew was not a devil, as he had been depicted throughout the Middle Ages but, on the contrary, a man of fine qualities and beautiful traits to anyone who really wished to see them. The great Dutch painter sought the real worth of the Jew and he found it at his elbow in the Amsterdam ghetto, thereby dealing a mortal blow to the medieval myth of a *bête noire*.

## THE JEWS IN MEDIEVAL LAW\*

By GUIDO KISCH

It is an old truism that the conditions of every age are mirrored in its laws. Hence, a survey of the laws, their aims, the ways and means whereby they seek to realize these aims, their success or failure, their relation to past, present and future laws furnishes a panorama of the age to which they owe their genesis. Law, as a pillar of every social community, has always occupied a central position in the history and destiny of peoples.

We are living in an age when we daily read and hear of Jews discriminated against or deprived of legal rights merely because they are Jews, and when the legal measures directed against the Jews are characterized as a return to the methods of the "dark Middle Ages." It is amazing, therefore, that no modern monograph on the legal position of the Jews in this period is available. What were the basic principles underlying the state's relations to the Jews during the Middle Ages, principles which found their repercussion in legislation, judicial practice, and legal doctrine of those days? In the Middle Ages, just as in modern times, the legal position assigned to the Jew by and in relation to his surroundings exercised a decisive influence upon his entire spiritual, religious, economic, social, and cultural development.

The policy of the medieval state toward the Jews was motivated and characterized by an inner contradiction arising out of the discord between medieval theory and reality. The conception current throughout the Middle Ages regarded the state as a single universal empire embracing all Christendom. In its structure spiritual and secular views were embodied in the same way as the soul is united with the body in the individual man. Christendom constituted one flock, one body, with Christ as its mystic head, king and shepherd. The Jews as unbelievers were outside of this community, and therefore were accorded a special

\* For source material and literature, see Kisch, Guido, "Research in Medieval Legal History of the Jews," in *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, vol. vi (1934-35) 229-76; Kisch, G., "The Jewry-Law of the Medieval German Law Books," *ibid.*, vii (1935-36) 61-145; vol. x (1940) 99-184. An extensive study of this subject is to appear shortly under the title, *The Jews in Medieval Germany: Their Status in the Light of Law-Books and Court Decisions*.

status. Hence the medieval state, subordinate to the omnipotence of the Church and dependent upon her legal principles, was bound to exclude a human group which was regarded either as unbelieving or else of a different faith. Wherever the interests of the Church and those of the state were identical, wherever the king promised to preserve and to further the true faith and to be the guardian of the holy Church, wherever the enforcement of the moral demands of Christianity appeared as the highest aim of earthly power, the state could not possibly protect a religious conviction different from and opposed to its own. According to the general conception, which found expression above all in theological doctrines and canon law rules, the Jews were justly handed over to woeful damnation and eternal servitude because of the guilt they had brought on themselves by their rejection of the Savior. But on the same basis of Christianity, theology and philosophy, secular legislation and legal theory clearly taught another doctrine: that Christian charity commands respect for the human dignity of the Jews also, and forbids the carrying of the first major premise to its strict logical conclusion.

These contradictory views called for reconciliation, especially with respect to the necessities of medieval economic life. While medieval society, Church-controlled and organized in fixed corporations and guilds, failed to grant the Jews admission, thereby excluding them from all legitimate callings, nevertheless at the same time a way was found to give them legal protection through the so-called *Judenschutz*, and to integrate them legitimately into the state. In accordance with that peculiar inconsistency, characterizing the medieval *Weltanschauung*, a compromise was arrived at which admitted the Jews, with certain restrictions, as a constituent part of the medieval state and incorporated them as active participants in the economic life. At the same time, however, the Jews were on sufferance, tolerated for the benefits derived from them, particularly those accruing to the state treasury.

Viewed in this light, the term Jewry-law (*Judenrecht*) and its historical significance becomes clear. Jewry-law is the special law for the Jews, which comprises the special legal rules determining their legal status in the Christian lands of Europe. Here, for over a millennium and a half, until the period of emancipation, they had to live under a legal code forced upon them from without, and they were rarely if ever permitted to exercise an influence on the making of the laws which governed their life.

To understand the attitude of the medieval state towards the Jews, as it found expression in positive law, one must pass in review the three major sources of Jewry-law: (1) Jewry-law in the strictest sense of the term, i.e., charters (privileges) and customary law, (2) judicial decisions which either applied the former in practice or reduced them to mere paper rights, (3) the basic ideas and discussions of legal theory. In the following survey the main attention is directed to Central Europe.

It was the king's privilege to place Jews under his protection. The Jews of Europe very early received from the various rulers guarantees of protection for their person and property, for life, honor and possessions, for their religious practices and necessary buildings, protection for their economic activities, freedom of trade, exemption from tolls and duties, permission to apply Jewish law, recognition of Jewish tribunals for internal Jewish affairs, and permission to employ Christian servants. Emperors, kings and princes at first granted such charters to individual Jews, later also to certain Jewish communities, and finally to all Jews who lived in a definite territory. These charters and the general statutes under municipal and provincial law defined and delimited the political status of the Jews, namely, their relations to the state and the authorities, their duty to pay taxes and render services, etc. They also contained regulations on the Jews' position under criminal, civil, and procedural law, and determined the measure of recognition to be accorded to Jewish law. The oldest charters of this kind that have come down to posterity, date from the reign of Emperor Louis the Pious (814-840); Emperor Henry IV granted similar charters to the Jews of Speyer and Worms, in 1090. The Jews paid the king an annual tax for his protection, a tax only slightly higher than that of the Christian merchants.

Within the framework of the charters the life of the Jews developed favorably. They could unfold their commercial activity freely, could care for their property and were on the best of terms with the Christian population. But the Church constantly emphasized the contrast of Christians to the infidels, who were held responsible for the death of the Savior. The intensity of religious pathos found an outlet during the First Crusade in cruel Jewish persecutions, especially in Germany. After the bloody events of the year 1096, for the first time the Jews were granted protection and security throughout the empire in a general law, the first imperial land peace of 1103. Here they are mentioned along with clerics, merchants and women, and included in the group of people especially in

need of protection (*homines minus potentes*). It was surely no mere chance that in 1119 for the first time Jews were also assured of security of life, property and religious practice in a papal bull.

After the storms of the Crusades peace was again gradually restored, the Jews were allowed to return to their homes, the Jewish communities recovered, and new communities could arise. In the rising cities the commercial talents of the Jews proved indispensable. Jews often entered into a permanent legal relationship with the cities. Up to the middle of the fourteenth century the law content of the municipal rights and duties of the Jews was identical with that of Christian citizens. The Jews were actually designated as citizens, and the rights of citizenship conferred on them were not essentially different from those enjoyed by Christian city dwellers. They had the right of domicile, enjoyed legal protection of life and property, were entitled to acquire real estate and mortgages in all parts of the city and were permitted to dwell among the other citizens. Their activity in trade and industry was scarcely subject to legal restrictions, and Jewish craftsmen were to be found in many places. Jews, like the Christian citizens, were subject to the cities' taxes and military requirements.

But in accordance with the medieval conceptions, not yet enlightened by modern ideals of the rights of man and of citizens, the law governing Jewish city dwellers showed one distinction: Jews could not exercise political rights in the medieval urban community and were thus also excluded from public offices. This meant little, however, to the medieval Jew. For, on the other hand, the Jewish community had complete autonomy in governing its own internal and external affairs, including the administration of justice; even their direct relationships with the king were not impaired.

This legal relationship was only gradually transformed into a state of complete political, economic, and personal dependence, the so-called *Kammerknechtschaft*, which in the later Middle Ages subjected the Jews as the sole *servi camerae imperialis* to the emperor or other rulers. After the imposition of a regular imperial poll-tax on the Jews in 1342, it finally resulted in personal unfreedom. The legal institution of Chamber Serfdom was not confined to Germany but appears in similar forms almost all over medieval Europe.

In judicial practice the Jews were treated almost completely on a par with the Christians, insofar as the general courts had jurisdiction over



them. This fair treatment of the Jews derives from the medieval concept of God as the source of all law. The author of the foremost German law-book of the Middle Ages, the *Sachsenspiegel* (ca. 1221-24), states: "God is Himself Law, hence He loveth Law." "God is himself just, He is Justice itself." If God is law, then every legal infraction is a sin, and every sin a legal infraction. The world of law is at the same time the world of morality. Justice is one of the cardinal virtues, according to the medieval moral code. The judge was in God's place. His highest task and duty were "to strengthen Right and to weaken Wrong." And: "The judge shall help everyone to obtain justice, if it is asked of him."

The conception of equality of all men before God led to equality of all men before the law. Hence legal disputes affecting Jews were decided according to the same principles and in the same manner as those of Christian parties. In the many legal decisions issued by the "Supreme Court" or *Oberhof* of Magdeburg, highly respected throughout Europe, and other superior courts, from the twelfth to the fifteenth century, the jurors never let themselves be carried away by prejudice against a Jew to the point of perverting the law.

Furthermore, medieval legal doctrine as expressed in the "law-books," being private records of customary law compiled by expert lawmen, was generally just to the Jew. The special position of the Jews described and the changes in their legal status originating from political factors had to be taken into account, to be sure. However, they were not particularly emphasized in the law-books, but were presented and discussed objectively and with juridical fairness. In legal doctrine the Jew was considered a legal comrade and was treated as such; not as an equal in every respect, it is true, but still on the basis of fellowship. The special regulations for Jews meant that, except for these regulations, Jews in their relations to Christians were subject to the same rules as their Christian fellows.

National-Socialist pseudo-science has claimed that the modern concept of race was already known to the Middle Ages, that the antithesis of races was recognized then, and that besides religious and economic causes, one must look for the element of racial distinction as an important reason for the special legal treatment of the Jews and for their persecution, particularly at the close of the Middle Ages. No unambiguous proof for this assertion has been brought forward from the wide domains of medieval legislation, legal doctrine, and judicial practice. Although the scholarly world could rightfully pass over unfounded

theories concocted for purposes of political propaganda, it seems appropriate to call attention to a striking example of evidence to the contrary. The *Schwabenspiegel*, a law-book composed about 1275, in which the influence of canon law was most pronounced, particularly by the incorporation of a series of anti-Jewish regulations, fixed the penalty of death by fire for Christians and Jews convicted of mutual sex relations. Is this perhaps a medieval regulation against "race defilement"? The South-German law-book itself answers the question unmistakably through its juridical qualification of the crime as "denial of the Christian faith" (*wan der cristenman hat cristengelouben verloungnet*," article 272 in Gengler's edition). Such a person was regarded as guilty of an attack upon the state religion, and his crime was designated as *Ungelouben*, that is, heresy or unbelief. This is the sole explanation for the severe penalty imposed on the Christian offender and *per analogiam* also extended to the Jew. Death by fire was in the Middle Ages above all the punishment for heresy and apostasy. Other sources assign reasons similar to those given in the *Schwabenspiegel*. Considerations of a religious nature alone are here at play. Of racial ideas not the slightest trace is discoverable.

Surveying the attitude toward the Jews of medieval law in its various functions, namely, legislation, judicature, and legal doctrine, one may make the following statement: Medieval law was conscious of the peculiar position of the Jews as a separate religious entity. But it took into consideration and tried to understand the unique situation and requirements of the Jews imposed by their religion. The high moral conception of law, justice, and judicial office made it impossible to tamper with the rights of the Jews by a conscious twisting of the law.

The question inevitably arises: how is it that at about the middle of the fourteenth century the Jews suffered cruel persecution in all German cities and elsewhere in spite of their favorable legal treatment? How is it that after the second half of the fourteenth century their social and legal status took a decided turn for the worse? How is it that secular Jewry legislation in the late Middle Ages changed its traditional attitude toward the Jews?

The answer is that the laws of a people do not permit us to draw direct conclusions as to its social conditions. Those peoples which have the severest laws are not always the most moral. Thus it would be false to conclude from the favorable legal position of the Jews in the Middle

Ages that their social status was equally favorable. It is true that their social position depended largely on the content and development of the state's legislation concerning them. But it was also influenced by extra-legal factors and, conversely, it reacted again upon the legal status. It was also affected by the religious, economic, cultural, and psychological conditions of the time.

The Church, the other chief political power of the Middle Ages, dogmatically bound unlike the state, for centuries and with admirable consistency tried in every way possible to segregate the "unbelievers" from the flock of true believers, in order to protect the Christian religion and its adherents from any danger of harmful influence. Little wonder, therefore, that slowly but consistently the canonical legislation concerning Jews affected the state's Jewry legislation. Ecclesiastical propaganda encompassing the Christian world soon transformed the Jewish question into a problem of international importance. The Church laws in their all-embracing authority were not restricted to the *forum ecclesiasticum* alone. They were constantly reiterated and reinforced by provincial councils and local synods. Ecclesiastical courts watched over their enforcement. Thus they could not fail to impress themselves also upon secular legislation, which either adapted itself to the Canon law requirements or directly adopted the regulations of the Church. Accordingly, the status of the Jews under secular law, particularly after the "Reception of Roman Law," was destined to gradual deterioration.

Moreover, an economic phenomenon recurring from the early Middle Ages to this very day comes into play. The Jews, through their talents and activities, have in every age and in every type of economy fulfilled an economic function. In the Middle Ages they were needed and used for certain pioneering activities (trade, moneylending, pawnbroking, etc.). This need existed as long as the majority of the population had either no interest in or no ability for such economic services. As soon as they learned to satisfy this need themselves, the mission of the Jew was finished. Displacement from his position in the economic life followed sooner or later; he had to look for other opportunities to perform pioneering functions in new fields, but again only until the majority group should once more move into them. This is an endlessly recurring process, an endless curve of ups and downs. It serves to explain only the Jews' function in medieval economy which, of course, also affected their status in the social life.

The continual complaints against Jewish moneylenders, coming from all classes of the medieval population, particularly in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, necessarily made the Jew an unpopular figure. The fact that the Jews' services could not be dispensed with when necessity arose, did not reduce the ever-growing intensity of popular sentiment against Jewish business activities. True, some circles recognized the social need for professional moneylending as a requirement arising from contemporary economic conditions. But there was little or no understanding in the broad masses of the economic changes and their requirements. The greatest obstacle to a universal recognition of the necessity of more modern economic methods was, however, the fact that theology and Canon law conducted an almost permanent crusade against usury and usurers. Hence, there is some truth in the remark that usury secured the Jews official protection at the price of public detestation. The continuous deterioration in their popular estimation, derived from their main vocation, even if not accepted universally, was bound to affect their social reputation seriously. The final product was "contempt and hatred which had sunk so deeply into the public consciousness that not even the highest authorities of the Church and State were able to meliorate it." The centuries-old process of cultural and social adaptation of the Jews was slowly transformed into one of progressive dissimulation and gradual elimination from the indigenous culture and society. The invention of the host-desecration fable, the revival of the myth of image mutilation, the spread of the ritual murder and blood accusations, the charges of poisoning the wells become intelligible from this angle. Once popular sentiment had adopted such an attitude the way was cleared for outlawing the Jew. This was done gradually and regionally only at the end of the Middle Ages.

For centuries medieval law maintained its position against all the powerful influences emanating from the religious, economic, political, social, and psychological factors. For, according to the medieval concept of the state, the law stood above the power of every ruler. It was the state's function to maintain and to defend the "good old" law. This faith in the immutability of legal norms encountered in Christianity a spiritual attitude which asserted that the consciousness of moral obligations was rooted in the individual human personality. Devotion to the old divine law was hence both a legal and a moral duty. Law, not made by man, could not lawfully be altered by man, not even by the King. Altering

it meant, indeed, an unlawful infringement of the law. Thus the treatment of the Jews in the latter half of the Middle Ages, the temporal and numerical restrictions, their exclusion from the ownership of land, the designation of special living quarters and the prescription of distinguishing dress or other visible signs of distinction for them, in short, their degradation to citizens of second rank did not spring primarily from law, but resulted from political, religious, economic, social, and psychological reasons.

For centuries judicial decisions and legal doctrines did not allow anti-Jewish bias any access into the realm of law, but granted the Jew too law and justice. It was indeed a notable achievement of law and justice in the "dark Middle Ages" to impede the decline of medieval Jewry.

## THE JEWS AND ISLAM

By SAMUEL ROSENBLATT

Islam is today one of the most popular religions of mankind, counting more than two hundred million devotees scattered in large groups over a territory extending from Morocco in the West all the way to China and the Philippine Islands in the East.<sup>1</sup> Founded some 1300 years ago by a camel-driver of Mecca, by the name of "Mohammed," the Moslem creed conquered within the first century of its birth besides the land of its origin a far-flung domain including Persia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Egypt and the whole of North Africa as well as the Iberian Peninsula. Its champions even penetrated into France as far as Tours where their advance was checked by Charles Martel. At a subsequent period Sicily and a part of southern Italy were for a while in Moslem hands and during the sixteenth century an Islamic power, the Ottoman Turks, having made itself master of the terrain of the former Byzantine empire, swallowed up Asia Minor and the Balkan Peninsula and actually knocked at the gates of Vienna. The spread of the Moslem religion over countries which were thickly inhabited by Jews brought it about that for a good many years the majority of the Jewish population of the world lived under the crescent. It becomes, therefore, of particular interest to find out how they fared in this environment and no study of antisemitism can be complete that does not pay some attention to the position of the Jews under Islam.

In considering this subject it is necessary to note at the outset that Islam was never claimed by its founder to be an original creation. It was, according to him, merely a continuation of the two creeds from which it was derived. Yet it was not an exact replica of Judaism and Christianity for it deviated from them in certain significant details. It was, therefore, inevitable that conflict should arise between the parent faiths and their offspring—and that conflict almost from the moment of the latter's birth. The development of a lively polemic literature<sup>2</sup> in which Moslems took

<sup>1</sup> Hartmann, Martin, *Der Islam*, p. 179 ff.

<sup>2</sup> A full bibliography of this literature has been compiled by Moritz Steinschneider in his *Polemische und apologetische Literatur in arabischer Sprache zwischen Muslimen, Christen und Juden*. Cf. also Ignaz Goldziher's discussion in the *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. xxxii (1878) 341-87.

issue over their religious views with Jews and Christians was a natural consequence. These polemics were initiated by none other than the Prophet of Allah himself<sup>3</sup> who, finding that he was at variance with both Judaism and Christianity and that he was on that account rejected by their adherents, felt compelled to defend his position by justifying his departures from the tenets of the older creeds, and his chief alibi was that Jews and Christians had wilfully perverted the original text of the Bible of which he and he alone possessed the authentic version.<sup>4</sup>

Now such slashes of opinion need not necessarily be accompanied by armed warfare. The arguments of the mind do not require the reinforcement of the logic of the mailed fist. With Mohammed, however, the establishment of the authenticity of Islam was not merely a question of veracity. It was also a personal matter, something in which his honor—nay his very life—was involved. He had among his Arab fellow-countrymen bitter enemies, who not only doubted his mission but persecuted him so inexorably that he was obliged to flee from his native Mecca. As a monotheist, who revered both the Old and the New Testament and spoke in the name of the God of Abraham,<sup>5</sup> Mohammed had counted in his plight on the recognition and support of the “peoples of the book”—under which term all non-idolators were included<sup>6</sup>—who were settled in and near the city of Medina, in which he had found refuge from his Meccan foes. He had reckoned especially on the aid of the powerful Jewish tribes who resided there. In this hope, however, he was destined to be sorely disappointed, for “the peoples of the book” not only refused to accept him but they taunted and mocked him, charging him with ignorance and imposture, and even conspired against him with his enemies, after having sworn friendship and peace. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that when his army was victorious, the founder of Islam wreaked vengeance upon those who, on account of proximity of belief, he had hoped would be his allies and flock to his standard and whom at first he had respected as men to whom God had revealed himself; and that he punished them for their stubbornness, their hostility and their treachery by exile and, in one instance, by public massacre. The circumstance of their preponderance in numbers in northern Arabia

<sup>3</sup> *Encyclopedia of Islam*, article “Ahl al-kitāb.”

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Koran*, II 70, III 64, V 15, VI 91.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Koran*, II 129.

<sup>6</sup> *Encyclopedia of Islam*, article “Dhimma.”

brought it about that the majority of the unbelievers among the "peoples of the book" who felt his wrath were Jews. Yet it would be unfair to construe Mohammed's punitive acts against the Banu Kainuka, the Banu Kuraiza and the Banu al-Nadir as a policy directed exclusively against Jews, for he employed the same methods with all those who opposed him, aye he was more severe with his Arab kinsmen who persisted in their paganism than with those who, like himself, believed in the one God even though they were foreigners.<sup>7</sup>

The bitterness and vituperation which the founder of the Moslem religion felt against his Jewish neighbors, especially during the last few years of his life, and which are reflected by his utterances recorded in the Koran, did not leave any marked traces on his immediate successors. The early caliphs, who were the builders of the Islamic empire, were too much preoccupied with the extension of their political power to concern themselves greatly with the beliefs of their subjects. They were too dependent on the good will of the civilized peoples whom they had conquered to risk the danger of incurring their animosity by interfering with their religious institutions, and so if these only paid the tax and promised loyalty to the Moslem governments which gave them protection, they were left undisturbed. There was ample authority for such treatment of the adherents of other monotheistic faiths in the Koran and in the traditions of the Prophet. "There is no compulsion in religion," declares the holy book of Islam,<sup>8</sup> and in the *hadith* Mohammed is reported to have stated: "He who wrongs a Jew or a Christian will have myself as his indicter on the Day of Judgment."<sup>9</sup> The only exception to the tolerant attitude of the worldly-wise Omayyads was Omar II who reigned from 717 to 720 and who, owing to pietistic influences, curtailed the rights of unbelievers in his realm.

It is first with the advent of the Abbassid dynasty towards the end of the eighth century, when the political power of Islam was already consolidated, that a less tolerant policy begins to be definitely formulated. It is then that the codes defining the restrictions pertaining to Jews and Christians which purport to go back to the second successor of Mohammed, the Caliph Omar I, emerge and that the demand is made that these rules be enforced.<sup>10</sup> The limitations applied to costume, mount, the

<sup>7</sup> *Encyclopedia of Islam*, article "Ahl al-kitāb."

<sup>8</sup> Koran, II 257.

<sup>9</sup> Beladhori, *Futuh al buldan*, ed. by M. J. de Goeje (Leyden 1866) p. 162.

<sup>10</sup> *Encyclopedia of Islam*, article "Ahl al-kitāb."



carrying of arms, testimony in the lawcourts, intermarriage with Moslems, the building and repair of houses of worship, publicity in the practice of religious rites and the holding of executive positions in the government.<sup>11</sup> Non-Moslems were to be distinguished from the devotees of Allah by the dress they wore. They were forbidden to ride on horses or mules. They were not permitted to erect new synagogues or churches, particularly in Moslem neighborhoods. They were disqualified as witnesses in lawsuits involving Moslems, etc.

This was, however, only theory. That the practice did not always correspond to it is evident from the frequent reiteration of the ordinances which the neglect of them made necessary. But whatever the practice may have been, this much is certain: that there was no such thing as a fixed and consistent policy. Whether the laws pertaining to the "protected peoples" were enforced rigidly or loosely depended upon the character and the temperament of the sultan and the circumstances of the time. A pious ruler would, in a moment of religious remorse, dismiss all his non-Moslem officials, and a little while after, with the return of sobriety, appoint them again. This happened in the case of the Caliph al-Muqtadir, who ruled between 908 and 932.<sup>12</sup> There were also not wanting outbursts of popular feeling that resulted in excesses in which the Moslem population would turn upon the members of the other faiths living in their midst, destroying the latter's homes and houses of worship, massacring the men and selling the women and children into slavery. An incident of this sort occurred in Granada, Spain, on December 30, 1066, when an infuriated mob of the Moslem inhabitants of that city pounced upon their Jewish neighbors, murdering about four thousand of their number and plundering their dwellings.<sup>13</sup> At that time Joseph, the son of the celebrated Jewish statesman, Talmudist and poet, Samuel Ibn Nagdela, who was himself a victim of this uprising, was vizir of King Badis. What motives brought it about is indicated in the following excerpt from a poem of the *fakih* Abu Ishak of Elvira which contributed considerably to enkindling the flames of passion of the Moslem population of Granada:

Go my messenger and relate these words to all the Sinhejites. . . .

Your master hath done a deed at which his ill-wishers rejoice: though he could choose a minister among believers, he hath chosen an infidel!

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, article "Dhimma," and A. S. Tritton's *The Caliphs and Their Non-Muslim Subjects*, p. 5 ff.

<sup>12</sup> Tritton, *ibid.*, p. 23.

<sup>13</sup> Dozy, R., *Spanish Islam*, tr. by F. G. Stokes (London 1913) p. 653.

Through this minister the Jews, contemptible outcasts, have become great lords, and their pride and arrogance know no bounds. . . .

I came to Granada, and there beheld the Jews reigning. They had parcelled out the provinces and the capital between them. . . . They collected the taxes, they made good cheer, they were sumptuously clad, while your garments, oh Moslems, were old and worn out. All the secrets of the state were known to them; yet is it folly to put trust in traitors! While believers ate the bread of poverty, they dined delicately in the palace. They have supplanted you in your master's favor, oh Moslems, and will you not oppose them? . . . Think not that it would be treachery to slay them! Nay, but treachery is it to suffer them to sit in high places. . . .<sup>14</sup>

Similar sentiments of jealousy, called forth by the favorable position of the Jews under the Fatimids, were entertained somewhat earlier by an Egyptian poet who gave vent to his feelings in such sarcastic verses as:

The Jews of this age have attained their highest hopes  
and grown strong.

Power is theirs and wealth and from them is chosen  
the counsellor and the king.

Men of Egypt, turn Jews, I advise you. The sky  
has turned Jew.<sup>15</sup>

With all this, however, the Jews did not suffer any more from such excesses than the Christians. In fact, of the two denominations the lot of the former was by far the pleasanter under the crescent. The exilarch of the Jews enjoyed all the privileges of a secular prince while the Christian patriarch was treated only as a dignitary of the church.<sup>16</sup> The relative inferiority of the position of the Christians in Islamic lands may be gauged by the fact that often in times of persecution Christians would don the turban of the Jews in order to escape danger.<sup>17</sup> This does not mean that Moslems as a whole did not often harbor prejudices against the Jews. Many a popular saying reveals the hostile state of mind of at least a part of the Moslem masses with regard to the Jew and their unfriendly opinion of him. "A Jew will never pay his taxes until he has had his head smacked," declared one of them.<sup>18</sup> "Never is a Jew alone with a Moslem without planning how he may kill him," states another.<sup>19</sup> Again there is a Moslem tradition that "on the last day the faithful will battle with the

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 651 ff.

<sup>15</sup> Cited by Mez, A., *Die Renaissance des Islams* (Heidelberg 1923) p. 55.

<sup>16</sup> Mez, *ibid.*, p. 31 and note 3.

<sup>17</sup> Tritton, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 95.

<sup>19</sup> Jahiz, *Bayan*, i. 165.

Jews, wherever the stones will say to the believers: 'Behind me lurks a Jew, oh Moslem, strike him dead.'"<sup>20</sup> It is also reported of the Jewish physician, Musa, that he advised his kadi on his deathbed to forbid to Jews the practice of medicine because the latter think it right to kill those who profane the Sabbath.<sup>21</sup> Finally it was popularly believed that foul smell was a Jewish peculiarity.<sup>22</sup>

It is difficult to determine how widespread these conceptions were. That in spite of them the Jews felt safer under Moslem than under Christian rule is apparent from the numerous occasions in which, when hard pressed by Christian sovereigns, they fled to the domains of Moslem rulers. The Islamic conquest of Spain from the Visigoths was equivalent to deliverance for the Jewish communities of that country and the invaders were hailed as saviors. And again, when in 1492 Christian Spain cast out its Jewish inhabitants the majority of the exiles found refuge in a Moslem state, the Turkish empire, where they were granted numerous privileges and rose to high estate.

Of real antisemitism of an all-embracing character one hears very little in the early history of Islam. The one major exception was that of the fanatical Almohades, who in the middle of the twelfth century seized the reins of government in Morocco and southern Spain and who, because of their desire to establish a totalitarian state, decided to eliminate all non-Moslems, giving those that were present in their domains at the time of their conquest the choice between Islam and death, which latter alternative they later commuted to exile. It was this edict that compelled Moses Maimonides to leave his native city of Cordova. It is noteworthy that to this very day the Maghreb or western portion of North Africa, the stronghold of the Almohades, has remained a hotbed of Moslem intolerance and the center of the fiercest anti-Jewish excesses in the Moslem world.<sup>23</sup>

With all that the burden of Islam even under the Almohades and the Mohammedan zealots of Yemen was by no means as heavy on the pseudo-converts who had embraced the Islamic faith for appearance's sake as was that of Christianity upon the marranos of Spain and Portugal. While the Inquisition exercised the strictest vigilance over the neo-Christians,

<sup>20</sup> Musnad Ahmad, ii, 122, 131, 149; Bukhari, "Jihad," no. 93.

<sup>21</sup> Tritton, *op. cit.*

<sup>22</sup> Mez, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. *Encyclopedia of Islam*, article "Ghiyar," and Schreiner, M., "Notes sur les juifs dans l'Islam," in *Revue des Études Juives*, vol. xxix (1894) 206-13.

punishing with the severest penalties the slightest sign of Judaizing, all that the Moslem rulers demanded was the formal verbal acquiescence in the prophetic character of Mohammed, which having been obtained, the former non-Moslem from which it was extracted was no longer molested. The attitude of Islam is well characterized by a Spanish Moslem, who had been driven out of his native land during the last expulsion of Moriscos from that country in the year 1610.

Did our victorious ancestors, he asks those who expelled him, ever once attempt to extirpate Christianity out of Spain when it was in their power? Did they not suffer your forefathers to enjoy the full use of their rites at the same time that they wore their chains? Is it not the absolute injunction of our Prophet, that whatsoever nation is conquered by Musalman steel should, upon the payment of a moderate annual tribute, be permitted to persevere in their own pristine persuasion, how absurd soever, or to embrace whatever belief they themselves best approved of? If there may have been some examples of forced conversions they are so rare as scarce to deserve mention, and only attempted by men who had not the fear of God and the Prophet before their eyes, and who, in so doing, have acted directly and diametrically contrary to the holy precepts and ordinances of Islam which cannot, without sacrilege, be violated by anyone who would be held worthy of the honorable epithet of 'Musalman.' . . . You can never produce, among us, any blood-thirsty formal tribunal, on account of different persuasions in points of faith, that anywise approaches your execrable Inquisition. Our arms, it is true, are ever open to receive all who are disposed to embrace our religion; but we are not allowed by our sacred Alcoran to tyrannize over consciences. Our proselytes have all imaginable encouragement and have no sooner professed God's Unity and His Apostle's mission than they become one of us, without reserve; taking to wife our daughters, and being employed in posts of trust, honor and profit; we contenting ourselves with only obliging them to wear our habit and to seem true believers in outward appearance, without ever offering to examine their consciences, provided they do not openly revile or profane our religion.<sup>24</sup>

To sum up, then, while there were not wanting during the first few centuries of Islam instances of anti-Jewish sentiment as well as actual excesses against the Jews on the part of both the Moslem public and the government, the policy was by no means as consistent nor were the persecutions as severe on the whole or the feelings as bitter as they were in Christian countries. This was due to a variety of causes which are to be found in the nature of the Islamic religion and the constitution of the

<sup>24</sup> Morgan, J., *Mahometism Explained* (London 1723-25) p. 11, 297 ff., 345.

Islamic empire, in both of which respects Islam differed considerably from Christianity. The first of these was, as has been noted, the comparative tolerance on the part of Islam of other monotheistic faiths. The second was the absence in Moslem society of a strongly centralized church such as existed in the Christian world. Thirdly, the Jews were never charged by Islam, as they have been by Christianity, with having caused the death of its founder. The fourth reason for the friendlier relationship may have been the racial kinship between the Jews and the people which produced Islam. The fifth was undoubtedly the fact that the Islamic sphere of influence contained too many heterogeneous elements to be able to afford to be totalitarian. All these factors took the edge from the anti-Jewish excursions which took place within the Moslem world in which the bulk of the Jewish population resided during the first few centuries of Islam and made the lot of the Jew less onerous there than in lands in which the cross was supreme.

With the decline of the power of Islam the situation of the Jews in Moslem lands has not been appreciably changed. Whether they were well treated or not depended to a great extent upon the economic conditions and the social and cultural niveau peculiar to each country. The rising tide of nationalism has also not been without its consequences. In Egypt, for example, the position of the Jews has been during the past few centuries and continues to be very favorable. In Yemen they are still exposed to humiliating regulations which have in recent years caused many Yemenite Jews to emigrate. In Algiers their superior political status, the fact that they were privileged with French citizenship, a privilege that was not granted to the other natives and their securer economic status aroused against them the ire of the Moslem population and gave rise to bloody riots.<sup>25</sup> In Persia Shiite fanaticism has been responsible for the coming into being of Moslem crypto-Jews who are very anxious to settle in countries where they can openly profess their adherence to Judaism.<sup>26</sup> The upsurge of nationalism in Turkey has been the cause of discriminatory legislation affecting Jews as well as other non-Turkish residents of that country.<sup>27</sup> The same holds true for Iraq. Finally, the growth of the Jewish settlement in Palestine has led to anti-Jewish disturbances. All these antagonisms, however, have nothing to do

<sup>25</sup> *American Jewish Year Book*, 1935-36, p. 174.

<sup>26</sup> Cohen, Israel, *The Journal of a Jewish Traveller*, p. 262 ff.

<sup>27</sup> *American Jewish Year Book*, 1930-31, p. 126.

directly with the Islamic religion even though the religious factor may have been played up by those who incited the riots, as happened in the summer of 1929 in Palestine. They are due to political expediency or economic rivalry, and the opinion ventured and expressed by A. de Gobineau in 1865 still holds today that:

If one separates religious doctrine from political necessity, which has often spoken and acted in its name, there is no religion more tolerant—one might even say more indifferent, regarding the faith of men than Islam. This organic disposition is so strong that outside of the cases where the reason of state, put into play, has led the Moslem governments to use force in order to bring about unity of religions, the completest tolerance has been the rule furnished by dogma. One must not regard instances of violence or cruelty committed on one occasion or another. If one studies the situations carefully one would clearly discover causes entirely political or grounded in human emotions and temperament. The religious factor is only invoked as a pretense but in reality remains outside.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>28</sup> *Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale* (Paris 1865) p. 24 ff.

# ANTISEMITISM IN TSARIST RUSSIA

## *A Study in Government-Fostered Antisemitism*

By MARK VISHNIAK

The distinctive characteristics of antisemitism in tsarist Russia were determined by the fact that Russia was about 150 years behind the nations of Western Europe in its political, social and cultural development. It was not until 1861 that steps were taken towards the emancipation of the serfs and it was not until 1904-1905 that some measure of liberal and constitutional administration was introduced into the autocratic regime. Until the very liquidation of the monarchy in February, 1917, Russia and Rumania were the only countries in the world where antisemitism was a part of official government policy, determining domestic, and to some extent also, foreign policies. Russian antisemitism was nourished from three sources: (1) religious prejudice against an alien faith; (2) economic opposition to the business competitor and rival; (3) political animosity to all who were opposed to the autocratic system. Antisemitism in Russia originated long before the word itself came into use in Germany in 1879 and long before it became a definite system. As a matter of fact government-inspired antisemitism existed in Russia even before the question of the "Jewish problem" arose. With very few exceptions the history of imperial autocratic Russia is a history of open or covert hostility to the Jew. In the last years of the Romanov dynasty antisemitism developed greater manifestations of cruelty, indicating the convulsions of a decaying and doomed regime. In these years of unrestrained cruelty, however, Russian antisemitism never descended to the low level of Nazi Germany. The agents of the tsarist government destroyed and calumniated Jews but they did not develop any philosophic theories or a *Weltanschauung* to mask their religious, economic and political contradictions. Quantitatively speaking, about 2,000 Jewish lives, victims of pogroms during the reigns of the last two Romanovs, obviously do not even begin to be comparable with the mass slaughters carried out by Nazi Germany.

The history of modern Russia begins with the reign of Peter the Great (1682-1725). More than two centuries separate the Russia of

Peter from that of its last autocrat, Nicholas II. The essential character of the autocracy, however, remained unchanged. The tsar was looked upon as the father of his subjects and as God's viceroy on earth. His powers and privileges were unlimited and he alone had the power to punish or forgive, rendering account only to God in heaven. The individual attitude of the tsar towards the Jews, therefore, was a primary factor in influencing the policy of the government towards the Jews. Peter the Great, in building Russia, invited foreigners from all parts of the world. The only exception he made was with regard to the Jews. "I prefer," he once said, "to see in our midst nations professing Mohammedanism and paganism rather than Jews. They are rogues and cheats. It is my endeavor to eradicate evil and not to multiply it. They shall not be allowed either to live or to trade in Russia, whatever efforts they may make, and however much they may try to bribe those near me."<sup>1</sup>

The immediate successors of Peter, Catherine I and Anna, did not give any special thought to the Jewish problem. They adopted the prevailing conception of the Western countries, looking upon the Jews as a "milch cow" or a "money-pot." The Jews would be allowed to settle and trade for a time and then would be driven from their homes and robbed of their savings. Thus in 1727 Catherine I issued a decree ousting the Jews from Little Russia and ordering the exchange of all their gold and silver for copper money.

Of special significance for the history of antisemitism in Russia is the ukase issued by the Empress Elizabeth on December 2, 1742, entitled "The Ukase on *Zhids*." The decree states as follows:

Although the settlement of *Zhids* all over our empire is forbidden, we find that through different ways and means these *Zhids* still continue to reside here and particularly in Little Russia. Our loyal subjects can expect nothing but evil from the haters of our Savior Christ. We therefore order the deportation abroad of all Jews, male and female, together with their property. In the future only those Jews shall be permitted to enter the country who will consent to embrace the Greek Orthodox faith.<sup>2</sup>

Several months later the Senate submitted a report to the Empress which stated that the expulsion of the Jews had had a serious effect upon the trade of Little Russia and the Baltic provinces. There was also a decrease in revenue from taxes and duties. The comment of the Empress on this

<sup>1</sup> Soloviev, S., *Istoriya Rosii s dreuneishikh vremion*, 2d ed., vol. xv, p. 1345; also quoted in Dubnow, S., *History of the Jews in Russia and Poland*, vol. i, p. 247.

<sup>2</sup> *Polnoye sobraniye zakonov*, no. 8673.



report was: "From the enemies of Christ I desire neither gain nor profit."<sup>3</sup>

The Empress Elizabeth could afford to adhere to such principles as long as only foreign Jews were concerned. With the partitions of Poland, however, White Russia, Volhynia, part of the Duchy of Kiev, Podolia and the provinces of Minsk, Grodno and Vilna were annexed to Russia, adding about 900,000 Jews to Russia. The former policy of lofty contempt could not be afforded any longer. Moreover, Elizabeth was succeeded by the more civilized and supposedly more liberal Catherine II. In a *placard* attached to the ukase of August 17, 1772, Catherine II declared:

From the aforesaid solemn assurance of the free exercise of religion and the inviolability of property for one and all, it follows of itself that also the Jewish communities residing in the cities and territories now incorporated into the Russian Empire will be left in the enjoyment of all those liberties which they possess at present, in accordance with the (Russian) law and (their own) property. For the humaneness of her Imperial Majesty will not allow her to exclude the Jews alone from the grace vouchsafed to all and from the future prosperity under her beneficent rule, so long as they on their part shall live in due obedience as faithful subjects, and shall limit themselves to the pursuit of genuine trade and commerce according to their callings.<sup>4</sup>

The position of the Jews was radically changing. In Poland they had formed a separate community, not being admitted into and avoiding contact with any of the groups of the Christian population. Becoming subjects of Russia the Jews were equalized in their rights with all of the other urban inhabitants and they engaged in trade and business with the Christians. This involved the Jews in self-government, in the apportionment and collection of taxes and duties, in the exercise of justice and administrative management and thus entitled them to all the special privileges granted to commercial and industrial groups. In this way a new motive was added to the former hatred of the Jews in Poland, a rivalry and struggle of the privileged groups against the admission of Jews into their circles. The age of Catherine II represented perhaps the only instance in the history of antisemitism in, tsarist Russia when antisemitism was the impetus to governmental action and not *vice versa*, as it was during the other reigns. It is significant that the civilized and liberal empress, who generally exercised unlimited power and even stubborn-

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 8840; see also Dubnow, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 257.

<sup>4</sup> Sliozberg, G. B., *Prauvoye i ekonomicheskoye polozheniye evreyev v Rosii*, p. viii; also Dubnow, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 307.

ness in disregarding the will of her subjects, listened obediently to the pleading of the Moscow and Smolensk merchants against the Jews. It is to the "enlightened" Catherine II that Russian Jewry is indebted for the establishment on December 23, 1791 of the shameful pale of restricted settlement for the Jews. This was the starting point for all the subsequent restrictions and oppression of the Jewish masses. Of the more than one hundred nationalities settled in Russia the Jews were the only non-nomadic people to be deprived of the elementary and natural right of a person to choose his place of domicile. The law and administration forced them to restrict themselves to the limited boundaries of the north-western and southwestern regions. The pale established by the government was not only topographical; it also debarred the Jews from economic activities of national importance and scope. By restraining the Jews from free intercourse with the Russian people this pale created an atmosphere of moral decomposition throughout the empire and caused an artificial state of distrust, prejudice and disdain between the Christians and the Jews. To the great majority of the Russian people—simple-minded and not at all predisposed to racial Jew-hatred—it appeared that all the political and legal restrictions imposed upon the Jews were simply expressive of the will of God and of the "Little Father." Antisemitism in Russia was the product of authority and the ruling classes. It was these classes who supplied the food, the material and the moral and psychological justification for the popular social antisemitism in Russia.

The dictum that whatever is beneficial to the Jews is harmful for Russia gained even wider acceptance during the reign of Paul I (1796-1801). The Jews were looked upon as the exploiters of the native Russian Christian population. It was not the landlords and privileged classes who were now accused of greed but the Jews. Even some of the early revolutionists and socialists in the 1870's and 80's charged the Jews with being "rural bloodsuckers." They developed a line of revolutionary strategy whereby the stimulation of hatred against exploiters was to bring forth a struggle against the entire system of autocracy.

Both Alexander I (1801-25) and Nicholas I (1825-55) pursued a Jewish policy which aimed to draw the Jews into the general political, economic and religious life of Russia. In line with this purpose measures were passed which prohibited Jews from participating in the distillation or sale of liquor. In order to attract Jews to productive agricultural work the government created Jewish agricultural colonies in

southern Russia. But while the restrictive measures were accompanied by a wave of expulsions with hundreds of thousands of Jews driven from their homes where they had lived for decades and deprived of any source of livelihood, the new form of adjusting the Jews to agricultural life provided only for very few. "In consequence of the expulsion of tens of thousands of Jews from the villages of White Russia in 1823," says Dubnow, "some two thousand refugees had drifted into the agricultural colonies of New Russia, but all they did was to replace the human wastage from increased mortality, which, owing to the change of climate and the unaccustomed conditions of rural life, had decimated the original settlers."<sup>5</sup>

The aim of the government to bring about at least an outward assimilation of the Jews led to the imposition of a special tax for wearing the long coat and skullcap; later the wearing of side-curls by men and the shaving of women's heads before their marriage was forbidden. On the other hand, the doors of the public schools, gymnasiums and universities were opened for Jewish students. Jews were permitted to open schools of general education with obligatory instruction of Russian and Polish or German.

The most characteristic aspect of this epoch, however, was the religious compulsion exercised upon the Jews with relation to their traditions and customs, the effort by force to make them renounce their own faith and join the world of Christ. After the relations between Alexander I and Napoleon became strained the Holy Synod of the Orthodox Church issued a circular informing the clergy and through them the body of the faithful that "to the great shame of the Orthodox Church he (Napoleon) in France had invited the Jewish synagogues and established the great Jewish Sanhedrin, the same ungodly council which once dared to sentence to crucifixion our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. He contrives to unite all the Jews scattered by the wrath of the Almighty all over the world, to destroy the Church of Christ and to proclaim a pseudo-Messiah in the person of Napoleon."<sup>6</sup> When, after the fall of Napoleon, almost all of the Duchy of Warsaw was annexed to Russia, the Jewish population in Russia was increased to almost two million. This added new concern to the mystically inclined tsar regarding the salvation of Jewish

<sup>5</sup> Dubnow, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 70-71.

<sup>6</sup> Ginsburg, S., *Otechesvennaya voina 1812 goda i russhiye evreii* (The Patriotic War of 1812 and the Russian Jews) (St. Petersburg 1912) p. 30.

souls. By special ukase a Society of Israelitish Christians was established on March 25, 1817. The function of this society was to render protection to converted Jews and to those preparing for the sacred conversion. Those who contributed in converting a definite number of Jews to the Orthodox Church were promised financial rewards and decorations. The converted Jews themselves were allured by concessions such as tax privileges, free land in the southern and northern provinces with the right to establish urban settlements, full equality of civil rights and the like.

Whereas Alexander I was concerned with the religious enlightenment of the misguided Jewish souls and their salvation beyond the grave, his brother and successor Nicholas I, a soldier in mind and character, was not inclined to depend upon the blessing and sacrament of baptizing the Jews. He resolved to break the Jewish isolation here in this world without expecting the salvation of their souls beyond the grave. He therefore decided to recruit the Jews for military service. Previous to this the Jews had been subject to a special tax in place of this duty. In 1827 an ukase was issued which provided for twenty-five years of military service for the Jews. This ukase was also intended to have a pedagogical function, namely, to free the younger Jewish generation from their national characteristics and to bring them in line with the native population. Saul Ginsburg recently published a document which throws considerable light on this aspect. It is a remarkable "memorandum," which was submitted to Nicholas I at the beginning of his reign. Having outlined all the "crimes" committed by the Jews against the whole world and against the peoples among whom they live, the "memorandum" recommends recruiting Jews into the army in twice the proportion of the Christian population, basing it on the same principles as the double taxation to which the Jews were subjected as compared with the other subjects. "The more significant benefit, however, of recruiting the Jews is that this extreme measure will force them to change their faith. Once in the army the Jew will finally realize that it is impossible to follow the precepts of his own religion and still more effective would be the bereavements and cruelties which await him there." Thus was ushered in the unhappy period of the so-called "cantonists," when young Jewish lads were drafted for service with the aid of the notorious "catchers." The Jewish communities were made responsible for the proper supply of the imposed number of recruits. According to a supplementary decree the age of the recruits

<sup>1</sup> See Ginsburg, Saul, *Historishe shriften*, vol. ii (New York 1937) p. 7-8.

drafted from the Jewish communities was to be from 12 to 25 years. Often, however, the drafters disregarded this instruction, and in order to fill the required quota of recruits, children of eight and ten were listed as twelve or over. This was sometimes motivated by the sympathy of the "catchers," who preferred to seize unmarried men or small children to breaking up the homes of married men.<sup>8</sup>

The compulsory imposition upon the Jews of these types of military and religious culture did not, however, bring a halt to the expulsions of Jews from the villages in many of the provinces. When the question was raised at a general meeting of the Council of State to grant Jewish merchants permission to reside in the interior provinces, the majority of the Council, including the tsar, opposed this on the ground that the admission of the Jews "would produce a very unpleasant impression upon our people, which, on account of its religious nature and its general estimate of the moral peculiarities of the Jews, has become accustomed to keep aloof from them and to despise them."<sup>9</sup> In this way the hostility towards the Jews among the antisemitic ruling circles was shifted to the "Russian people."

During the reign of Nicholas I too the phenomenon of ritual murder trials became more widespread. This charge against the Jews of using Christian blood for ritual purposes was not of independent Russian origin; it came from Poland. In 1772 Pukulski, a Polish priest, published a book under the title *Talmudic Tales Told by the Zhids Themselves*, in which the ritual murder charges were made. This book was translated into Russian in 1787. Ritual murder charges were made in various parts of the former Warsaw duchy. In the reign of Alexander I such a case appeared in Grodno in 1816. But even more important was the notorious Velizh case which started in 1823 and was not concluded until twelve years later.

The government made more than one attempt to solve the Jewish problem through various special committees and commissions. The government also applied cultural measures by establishing schools for

<sup>8</sup> Saul Ginsburg in vol. iii of his *Historische shriften* reproduces a number of very interesting documents on this subject. One is the "Extensive Instructions to Clergymen of Military Establishments with Regard to the Conversion of Jewish Pupils to the Christian Faith," published by the Holy Synod in 1843. Included also are a number of hitherto unpublished documents on the history of the cantonists and the forced conversion of Jewish children. On p. 62 is published for the first time a secret decree of Nicholas I permitting priests to baptize Jewish cantonists without the special permission of the archbishop.

<sup>9</sup> Dubnow, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 35.

general education, reorganizing the Jewish *heders*, the rabbinate, etc. But because the source of mischief was traced not to the violence exercised upon the Jews but mainly to their religious doctrine and to their vicious inclinations and habits all efforts were doomed. The government during the nineteenth century was repeatedly forced to admit its inability to eradicate the "deeply-rooted faults" of the Jewish masses with their attachment to "unproductive" and even harmful occupations, and their estrangement from the common civil state. In this respect forced assimilation, the military schools, Christianization and the recruiting proved to be just as useless as compulsory isolation, the pale, the prohibition of education and restrictions as to professions and trades.

The first half of the reign of Alexander II represents an exception to the whole history of Imperial Russia. It was different from the preceding periods and also different from the latter part of Alexander's reign. In keeping with the general liberal spirit of the great reforms the attitude towards the Jews too was free from the traditional, official antisemitic outlook. The government continued the policy of trying to bring about the assimilation of the Jews to the native population but the elements of compulsion were eliminated. The more detestable Jewish "privileges" were repealed; the special measures for Jewish military recruits were abolished; Jews were admitted to liberal professions and trades and they were given greater freedom of settlement. This did not mean, of course, that Jews were placed on an equal status with the rest of the population. But official or governmental antisemitism, while not disappearing completely, took on a much milder form.

At the same time that official antisemitism diminished, however, social antisemitism came to the fore. Before the epoch of great reforms of the 1860's Russian public opinion was only in its early stage of formation. The autocratic iron heel suppressed any manifestation of opinion not approved from above and public antisemitism, therefore, could exist only insofar as it was tolerated or encouraged by the ruling power. When some merchant group or some other such organization, upon their own initiative and not inspired by the government, made demands which were unfavorable toward the Jews their antisemitism was plainly of a covetous character, competitors disturbed about their own interests. When Pestel, the leader of the Decembrists, however, planned in his *Russkia Pravda* that the future Supreme Provisional Government would banish the Jews from Russia and help them establish a separate state in some part of Asia

Minor, this had no effect on public opinion, for this plan, together with the *Russkia Pravda* of Pestel, was not published until many decades after Pestel was executed.

Antisemitism was able to take on a social character only when, with the reforms of Alexander II and the advent of freedom of public opinion, there was opportunity for free expression. With this opportunity came many manifestations of unfriendly attitudes toward the Jews. It is an interesting sociological fact that social antisemitism in Imperial Russia burst forth just in the epoch of the liberal reforms of the 60's and 70's and, conversely, social antisemitism faded out when the beacons and mirages inspired by the epoch of great reforms were dimmed. During the reign of Alexander II (1855-81) it was not considered shameful to identify oneself as an antisemite. Antisemitism began to be defended ideologically by such exponents of Russian thought and spirit as Dostoevski, the historian Kostomarov, the head of the Slavophiles, Ivan Aksakov, the liberal *Golos*, the radical *Otechestvenniye Zapiski* and even by some of the ideologists of revolution and socialism. It was only when the liberal period was succeeded by the reaction under Alexander III (1881-94) and Nicholas II (1894-1917) that the revived official and governmental antisemitism forced out the social antisemitism. The official antisemitism assumed the functions and tasks of the unofficial social antisemitism and made the latter unnecessary. With the strengthening of the reaction those social forces that were opposed to or independent of the government avoided any sort of identification with official points of view. It is thus to the Russian autocracy that the Jews of Russia are indebted for the absence of social antisemitism in Russia and the intellectual barrenness of Russian antisemitism, while just at the same time social and intellectual antisemitism was so successful in Germany, Austria-Hungary and even France.

During the second half of the reign of Alexander II the old problem which had vexed the former autocrats was again raised: whether the Jews are a useful element for the Russian state and whether they are capable of blending with the native population. While touring his Polish kingdom in 1870 the tsar noticed a number of Hasidim with their long side-curls and long-lapped coats. This not only surprised the tsar but disturbed him. To comply with the will of the monarch, the authorities began to weed out the "ugly costumes" and the side-curls just as had been done in the previous reign.

During Easter week of 1871 a new method of solving the Jewish problem in Russia was introduced. On that day the Greek merchants of Odessa, due to competition with the Jewish merchants, started a pogrom against the Jews and some Russians joined the attack. For three days the Jews were massacred, their property plundered and destroyed and their synagogues defiled, all with the silent co-operation of the police and militia, until on the fourth day an order was issued to stop the pogrom. This pogrom was used as a technically-organized prototype for all the innumerable pogroms which followed the reigns of the son and grandson of Alexander II. In the case of this pogrom in Odessa the government was concerned lest there be a connection between this public instigation and the illegal revolutionary movement. But soon the attitude changed from that of fear of pogroms to indifference and even connivance in organizing them.<sup>10</sup>

On March 1 (13), 1881, Alexander II was fatally wounded by a bomb thrown by a terrorist-revolutionary and the throne was assumed by Alexander III. With the new reign an era of darkest reaction began in Russia. Severe persecution of the Jews not only as "pagans" and "exploiters," but also as "rebels," enemies of order and "regicides," became the order of the day. Only one Jewess, Hesia Helman, was involved in the March 1 event and only in a secondary way but on the day following the assassination of the tsar rumors were spread by word of mouth and in the press about the inevitably coming "outbreak of public resentment" against the Jews. One can judge how tendentious and artificial this charge was, from the speech delivered by Samuel S. Cox of New York in the House of Representatives on May 21, 1880, *i. e.*, more than nine months before the assassination of Alexander II. Representative Cox said in passing: "This persecution of the Hebrew is not because he is ignorant, communistic or nihilistic . . . They are advanced; they stand upon a higher plane . . . But nihilism does not belong to one sect; nihilism seems to be the asylum of despair, and despair is the result of despotism, tempered only by assassination."

The "outbreak" took place simultaneously in a number of different

<sup>10</sup> The best survey of the literature of this subject is found in E. Tcherikower's article, "New Materials on the Pogroms in Russia at the Beginning of the '80's," in *Historishe shriften*, published by the Yiddish Scientific Institute (Vilna 1937) vol. ii, p. 463. The same volume contains an exceptionally interesting article by N. M. Gelber on "The Russian Pogroms in the Early '80's in the Light of the Austrian Diplomatic Correspondence." A German digest of this article appeared in *Menorah* (1927).



places and according to a uniformly prearranged plan. The urban rabble as a rule was imported from other cities, and peasants from the surrounding area participated in it, while the authorities looked on with indifference. By their indifference and connivance they sanctioned and instigated these actions. Beginning in Elisavetgrad, the pogrom movement spread to the whole southwestern region. During the year 1881 there were pogroms in 215 places, even in such urban centers as Odessa, Kiev and Warsaw. Young and old were murdered, women were raped, human brains and intestines as well as featherbeds were scattered with the winds. Jewish households were wantonly destroyed and plundered, not always in a burst of passion, but with a cold-blooded consciousness, as though faithfully performing a duty. There were established cases where the plunderers acted in full belief that a pogrom on Jews represented a kind of patriotic service to the "little father," the tsar. In a village in the Chernigov province the peasants demanded from the village mayor a written certificate that they would not be prosecuted by the authorities for *not* participating in "killing the Jews." The mayor complied with their demand but for the sake of their own safety the peasants nevertheless plundered six of the Jewish houses.<sup>11</sup>

The movement reached such dimensions that the government became fearful lest the mob violence be directed against the regime too. The tsar's brother, the influential Grand Duke Vladimir, told the representative of the Jewish community, Baron Horace Günzburg, that "the anti-Jewish outbreaks have their source not exclusively in the resentment against the Jews, but in the attempt to create general unrest." On May 11, 1881, a Jewish delegation headed by the same Baron Günzburg was received by the tsar. Alexander III also blamed the outbreaks on the work of the anarchists but added: "There are, however, economic reasons which contributed to these outbreaks, as, for instance, the exploitation of the peasants by the Jews."<sup>12</sup> The official version of the cause of the outbreaks was thus established: responsible for the pogroms were the rioters-anarchists and the Jewish exploiters. The tsar nevertheless commissioned one of his royal attendants, Count Kutaysov, to investigate the causes of the outbreaks in South Russia. Kutaysov submitted a detailed report in which he outlined the cause of unrest as being due to the "abnormal

<sup>11</sup> Dubnow, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 257.

<sup>12</sup> Dubnow speaks only of "oral rumors" that such was the opinion of the tsar. This is officially confirmed in the report of the Austrian Ambassador, Count Kalnoki, of May 13, 1881. See Gelber, *l.c.*, p. 469.

relations established between the Christian and Jewish populations. These relations, however, are not due to conditions created by law, as is assumed by the Jews, but by the systematic and incessant exploitation of the local Christian population by the Jews and their unlimited aspirations and eagerness to acquire riches at the expense of their Christian neighbors. In addition the Jews display complete indifference to all other problems of social life which do not offer any material benefits to them." The report went on to say that the spread of the pogrom movement was due to the widespread opinion that these attacks were sanctioned by the tsar himself.<sup>13</sup>

At this time too public opinion abroad was aroused by the wave of pogroms and as a result of this pressure representatives of foreign governments undertook a number of official and unofficial steps in favor of the Jews, in order to compel the rulers of Russia to modify and soften the forms of their antisemitism. Some of these steps were dictated by purely humanitarian considerations, others by the desire to protect the interests of their citizens (United States) and still others by the desire to protect their territories from the influx of Jews fleeing from neighboring Russia (Austria-Hungary).<sup>14</sup> In answer to a representation by John Watson Foster, United States Minister to Russia, the Russian Foreign Secretary, De Giers, made the following statement: "America could afford to grant equal rights to Jews because the Jews of the United States belong to the better category of their race and there is no such necessity there for their isolation as exists in Russia." As for Russia, the Jews "are almost exclusively of Polish origin and form generally a nasty element for sociability, are occupied with smuggling illegal trade, are active in revolutionary conspiracies and plots against the life of the tsar."<sup>15</sup>

It cannot be said that the pogroms of the '80's were directed and deliberately instigated by the tsar's government. Marginal comments by Alexander III are found on many of the government reports on the

<sup>13</sup> *Materialy dlya istorii antisemiticheskikh pogromov v Rossii* (Materials on the History of the Anti-Jewish Pogroms in Russia) (1925) vol. II, p. 218, 276-78.

<sup>14</sup> The most informative survey of this aspect of the problem is the article by I. Lifshitz on "American Intervention in Reference to the Pogroms in Russia during the '80's," in vol. II of the *Historicheskie shriften*. The article is based on the reminiscences of John Watson Foster, American minister at St. Petersburg, and upon other official American sources. See also the remarkable speech of Samuel S. Cox in the House of Representatives on July 31, 1882 "on the Persecution of the Jews in Russia." Important too is the correspondence between the Austrian Secretary of the Interior, Count Taaffe, and the Foreign Secretary, Kalnoki, published by Gelber, *loc. cit.*, p. 492 ff.

<sup>15</sup> Lifshitz, *op. cit.*, p. 508-509.

pogroms. In these notes we find such remarks as "very sad," "extremely sad and perplexing," "it is impossible that no one had a hand in exciting people against the Jews. A thorough investigation of all these cases is necessary."<sup>16</sup> It did not occur to the tsar that the ignorant masses could have been aroused against the Jews by all the legislative and administrative practises of the government authorities. The inner feeling of the tsar toward the Jews is best revealed, however, by the comment he made on May 10, 1883 regarding the pogroms in Rostov-on-Don: "It is a great pity, but I do not foresee an end to it. The Russians are too much disgusted with the *Zhids* and so long as they continue to exploit Christians this hatred will not diminish." While the higher authorities did not formally give the orders to organize the pogroms, some of their agents did take part in them, partly on their own initiative and taking advantage of their official positions. In any case the authorities did not interfere with the pogroms nor did they try to mitigate the guilt of the principal organizers. Some of the members of the "Sacred League," formed immediately after the assassination of Alexander II by high officials for the sake of guarding the new tsar and the old autocracy, undoubtedly were the guides not only of the governmental policy of antisemitism but also of the pogrom movement, and they served as connecting links between the court and the gangster elements in the urban "lower depths."<sup>17</sup>

In order to prevent the spread of popular indignation in a direction undesirable for the government and in order to quiet international public opinion, it was finally decided to put a stop to bloody pogroms. In place of the bloody pogrom, however, came the "dry pogrom," the legal extermination of Jewish well-being and the destruction of their personal and national dignity. On May 3, 1882, the so-called "Temporary Rules" were approved by the tsar without deliberation by the State Council, and these rules were applied with inexorable severity during the following three and a half decades. The chief author and leading spirit behind these "Rules," the Minister of Interior, Count Ignatyev, saw the necessity for severe restrictions upon the Jews in the fact that they were "real bloodsuckers," and "leeches, sucking the blood of the honest working people." "What can we do," explained Ignatyev to the American Chargé d'affaires in St. Petersburg, Hoffman, "if on the one hand there are five

<sup>16</sup> R. Kantor has collected these marginal notes of Alexander III from the Russian archives and published them in *Evreiskaya Letopis*, vol. i (1923) 156 ff.

<sup>17</sup> Tcherikover, *op. cit.*, p. 449-50.

million Russian Jews and on the other hand eighty-five million Russian subjects who insist that we expel from the empire these five million Jews?"<sup>18</sup> Not all the statesmen, however, shared this point of view. For instance, the chairman of the Committee of Ministers, Count Reutern, during the deliberations concerning Ignatyev's "Rules," said at the conclusion of the debate: "The governmental authorities remain inactive in the face of obvious Jew-baiting. . . . Today they hunt and rob Jews, tomorrow they will go after so-called kulaks, who morally are the same as Jews only of the Orthodox Christian faith, then merchants and land-owners may be next. In a word, in the face of such inactivity on the part of the authorities, we may expect in a not distant future the development of the most horrible socialism. . . ." <sup>19</sup>

By the "Temporary Rules" the government deprived the Jews of the right to settle in villages outside of cities and towns; Jews were forbidden to acquire or rent real property outside of cities and towns; they were forbidden to do any trading on Sundays and Christian holidays. Educational opportunities were again limited. They were restricted in the practise of the liberal professions and were not permitted to occupy governmental positions. The autocratic government obviously was weary of "its" Jews. As Ignatyev very unceremoniously expressed himself: "It is true that the settling of Jews over the whole area of the empire is harmful to the interests of the native population. The 'pale' cannot be spread further to the east. The western border, however, is open for the Jews. . . . Their emigration would not be subect to any restrictions." To this policy the autocratic government remained true to the end of its days, only varying and perfecting the methods of intolerance and persecution of Jews.

The Judeophobia and the governmental antisemitism increased after the accidental wrecking of the tsar's train at the Borki station, on October 17, 1888, when Alexander III with his whole family escaped death. Alexander's escape from death was interpreted by the tsar's spiritual adviser, Pobedonostzev, as "a sign from above," as "a miracle" and as "the divine finger," indicating to the monarch to turn away from the path of reform and to lead Russia back to the path of piety of the days before Peter the Great. The court clergy, moreover, interpreted the Gospels as prescribing hatred of those who crucified Christ. These comments made due impres-

<sup>18</sup> Lifshitz, *op. cit.*, p. 513.

<sup>19</sup> Peretz, E. A. *Dnevnik* (Diary) (Moscow 1927) p. 131-33.

sion on the limited though God-fearing mind of the autocrat. When in 1890 one of his statesmen laid before the tsar a memorandum presenting reasons for the cessation of repressions against Jews, Alexander commented: "But we must never forget that the Jews crucified our Lord and shed His precious blood."<sup>20</sup>

When in October, 1894 Alexander III died and Nicholas II succeeded him, the general policies as well as the policies toward the Jews did not change in any way. In his very first public speeches Nicholas emphasized that he was going "to serve our dearly beloved country in the same way as did my late father and lead it on the bright and radiant path indicated by him." "Let it be known to all that devoting all my power to the welfare of my people, I will guard the fundamentals of autocracy with the same firmness and strictness as my unforgettable late father did."<sup>21</sup> Obedient to his father's will Nicholas retained as his spiritual preceptor and political adviser Pobedonostzev, the Procurator of the Holy Synod, "the inquisitor of the Church," as he was called by the more liberal Orthodox folk, and an ardent hater of Jewry. Pobedonostzev had a program of his own for the solution of the Jewish problem in Russia: "One third will die out, the other third will emigrate, the rest will dissolve itself without leaving any traces" (i.e., will become Christians).<sup>22</sup> Outspokenly antisemitic were also the nearest relatives of the tsar, his uncle and brother-in-law, the Grand Duke Sergei Aleksandrovich, who occupied the post of Governor-General of Moscow.

During the first decade of the new reign the governmental antisemitism manifested itself in legal restrictions and administrative persecutions. All the former restrictions of rights, previously mentioned, far from being mitigated, assumed more aggressive forms. Anti-Jewish pogroms occasionally took place but they were of episodic and local character, as the pogrom in Shpola (province of Kiev) on February 18-19, 1897; the three-day pogrom in Nikolaiev, Easter, 1899, and the quickly liquidated pogrom

<sup>20</sup> Dubnow, S., "Furor Judophobicus During the Last Years of the Reign of Alexander III," in *Evreiskaya Starina*, vol. x (1918) 28. See also Frederic, H., *The New Exodus, A Study of Israel in Russia* (London 1892) p. 173. See also Weber, John B., and Kempster, W., *A Report of the Commissioners of Immigration upon the Causes which Incite Immigration to the United States* (Washington 1892), accompanied by "An Abridged Summary of Laws, Special and Restrictive, Relative to the Jews in Russia, Brought down to the Year 1890."

<sup>21</sup> Speeches of Oct. 31, 1894 and Jan. 17, 1895. See *Pravitelstvennyi Vestnik* for 1894, no. 239 and for 1895, no. 14.

<sup>22</sup> Dubnow, S. M., *Evreii v Rosii v tsarstvovaniye Nikolaya II* (The Jews in Russia Under Nicholas II) (Petrograd 1922) p. 5.

in Czeszochowa on August 19, 1902. The ominous shadow of a new ritual murder charge appeared for a while in March, 1900 in Vilna in the case of the Jewish barber Blondes.<sup>23</sup>

Conditions became much worse in 1903 and the years following. A quarter of a century of reaction had nurtured the revolutionary movement. Sensing the growing movement of workers and peasants and irritated by the direct attacks of terrorists the government decided on the policy of trying to drown the rising revolutionary conflagration in blood both by starting the senseless war with Japan and on the home front by making bloody attacks on Jews. In retaliation for the participation by some Jews in the revolutionary movement all the Jews had to be penalized, even those who had not taken any part in it. A lesson given to Jews in one of the border cities of Russia, in Kishenev, the capital of Bessarabia, was supposed to be a warning also to all the other nationalities who filled the ranks of the revolutionists, the Poles, the Georgians, the Armenians, etc.

The Kishenev pogrom of 1903 was prepared by government agents and, particularly, by the Lieutenant-Governor of Bessarabia, Ustrugov, and a member of the police department, Levendal. Assistance to the pogrom by non-interference was also given by other agents of the government, headed by the governor and the commander of the garrison. These facts are responsible for the incredible cruelty of the pogrom: in two days 45 were murdered and 86 were severely and about 500 slightly injured; some 1,500 Jewish houses and stores were demolished and plundered. The monstrous pogrom of Kishenev was followed by a pogrom in Homel on August 29 of the same year. The local governor frankly divulged the "meaning" and the cause of the event: "The Jews have now become the leaders and instigators in all movements directed against the government. This entire Bund and the Social-Democrats—they are all Jews. You are yourselves to blame for all that happened. You do not educate your children properly. You have no influence over them. But at least you can surrender them, pointing them out to the government, whereas you conceal them."<sup>24</sup> Only at the price of surrender by Jewish parents of their ill-educated and revolutionary children was the government willing to give up the pogrom as a new method of ruling and controlling the stubborn Jews. From now on the pogrom always hung as a threat over the heads and conscience of the Jewish population in tsarist Russia. A pogrom was

<sup>23</sup> See Gruzenberg, O. O., *Vchera* (Yesterday) (Paris 1938) p. 112-13.

<sup>24</sup> Dubnow, *History of the Jews in Russia and Poland*, vol. iii, p. 89.

used as a threat, as a warning, as an argument—sometimes even by liberal defenders of Jews, who failed to sense that the very discussion of the question whether it is permissible or not to “beat the *Zhids*” was insulting. The Jewish pogroms, large and small ones, not only entered into the tsarist system of governing Russia, but general lawlessness and injustice became a part of everyday life itself. From 1903 on antisemitism became inextricably linked with the domestic and foreign policies of the tsarist government.

As the autocratic government was compelled to make some concessions to the growing liberal and revolutionary movements it also was forced to abolish some of the more glaring legal restrictions against the Jews. But in this direction the tsar's government was particularly unyielding, miserly and stubborn. In the very first act in which the government, defeated by Japan on land and sea, juridically surrendered before the principle of a state based on law, it also announced a “revision of existing rules and regulations, restricting the rights of non-natives.” As usual, of course, a joker concerning Jews was not omitted: with the condition, “that of the aforementioned (existing) rules and regulations only those be retained that are required by the essential interests of the state and clearly needed for the benefit of the Russian people.”<sup>25</sup> It was the same “essential interests” and “clear benefit,” however, which had inspired all the previous restrictions against Jews.

Russia entered the period of so-called “pseudo-constitutionalism” on October 17, 1905 with the granting of a “constitution” and the creation of the Imperial Duma. The tsar continued to consider and call himself, however, “By the Grace of God Emperor and Autocrat of All Russia.” Governmental policy toward the Jews continued to be openly hostile. Up to his death Nicholas II displayed sharp and open antagonism toward Jews. For him they were still the enemies of Christ as well as the enemies of the tsar, the bearer of autocratic power.

In the conflict between the autocracy and the revolution the Jews appeared in the front line, sometimes even only nominally. To the slogan of the revolutionary and liberal movement, “Down with the Autocracy,” the government forces replied with the antisemitic and reactionary cries: “Kill the revolutionists and the *Zhids*,” “Kill the *Zhids*—save Russia and the tsar.” A new series of pogroms began during the Passover season of 1905. Assaults took place in Bialystok, in the little town of Dusyaty, in

<sup>25</sup> *Sobraniye uzakovenii* (1904) Dec. 14, no. 189, article 1916.

Zhitomir and in the neighboring town of Troyanov. During the summer pogroms took place in Minsk, Brest-Litovsk, Siedlce, Lodz and Kertch. But all this was only a rehearsal and prelude to the bloody orgy that displayed itself over all of Russia on October 18-25, 1905, as a convulsive reaction of the "patriotic" counter-revolution to the tsar's proclamation of October 17, 1905 on the liberalization of the regime. In the course of one week some fifty bloody pogroms took place in such centers as Odessa, Kiev, Kishinev, Simferopol, Chernigov, Nikolaiev, Ekaterinoslav and other places—altogether a nightmare of 670 pogroms! The destruction was carried out in a systematic and planned manner, in full conviction of the justice of the acts and that it pleased the powers that be with the Christian tsar at the head. The destruction enjoyed the open as well as secret co-operation of the local agents of the government and the mobs carried in front of them portraits of the tsar, national flags and church banners.

Toward the end of 1904 a new antisemitic organization was formed after the pattern of Alexander III's Sacred League. The new organization was "The League of the Russian People," with its secret "Fighting Squadron," recruited from the lower agents of the secret and regular police and the gendarmerie, and with expenses paid by the government. It is interesting to note that the chief initiator of the new "Fighting Squadron" was Peter Rachkovski, who in 1881, as an insignificant young government functionary, was a member of the "Holy Squadron" and engaged in pogrom propaganda in Moscow and in Kiev under the command of Governor-General Drenteln. Rachkovski likewise had a hand in the spread of the notorious *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.<sup>26</sup> He con-

<sup>26</sup> The "Protocols" first appeared in the newspaper *Znamya* (The Banner), published in St. Petersburg by Krushevan, one of the principal inspirers of the Kishenev pogrom. The "Protocols" appeared in 9 issues, from Aug. 28 to Sept. 7, 1903, under the title, *Programma zavoyevaniya mira evreiami* (A Jewish Program to Conquer the World). These articles were reprinted in 1905 in pamphlet form but under a different title by a certain Butmi. At the same time again, the "Protocols" were published by the Staff of the Army of St. Petersburg Military Region under the title, *Koren nashikh bedstvi* (The Root of Our Misfortunes). Later other editions appeared. According to evidence produced by E. M. Tcherikover, who made a special investigation of this subject, "up to the Bolshevik revolution of October, 1917 neither the press nor public opinion in Russia gave any attention to the 'Protocols,' and even the Jewish press hardly responded to them. The articles in the *Znamya* were generally unnoticed, very few knew about the book by Nilus, more was known about Butmi, but mainly due to his role in the League of the Russian People." See also Burtzev, V. L., *Protokoly Sionskikh mudretzov* (The Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion) (Paris 1938) and the review of the same by this author in *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. i (1939) 259-61. Concerning the role of Rachkovski in building up the fraud of the "Protocols," see the article by S. Svatikov in *Evreiskaya Tribuna* (Paris 1921) no. 87; also *American Hebrew* (1921) nos. 15-16.



tinued to engage in the same kind of antisemitic pogrom activity during the reign of Nicholas II. When he became vice-director of the police department, in charge of its political division, he set up in 1905—within the police department building itself—a secret printing shop for the publication of pogrom literature against revolutionaries and Jews.<sup>27</sup>

The convocation of the Duma had no effect on the continued pogrom activity. On May 8, 1906 there was a bloody pogrom at Bialystok. When interpellations were made in the Duma during its session of June 8 one of the members, Prince Urussov, a former assistant minister of the interior, confirmed the fact that the secret printing shop of the police department published "patriotic" proclamations calling upon the people to do away with the Jews. He also quoted a statement by a gendarmerie officer who assured Prince Urussov that "a pogrom may be arranged on whatever scale you please, whether it be against ten people or against ten thousand."<sup>28</sup> On July 7, 1906 the Duma adopted a resolution severely censuring the government for its shameful antisemitic policy. The next day the Duma itself became the object of violence by the same government. By the tsar's ukase the Duma was dissolved, seventy-two days after it was convoked. And pogroms continued: on August 13 a pogrom in Siedlce resulted in the killing of thirty people and the wounding of one hundred forty.

The antisemitic, pogrom-making "League of the Russian People" now became the unofficial agent of the government. At its head stood Dr. Dubrovin, Purishkevich, Markov the Second, and a number of government officials such as the mayors of St. Petersburg and Odessa, Governor-General Kaulbars, Count Konovnitzyn and others. The program of "The League of Russian People" declared: "The well-being of the people is based on the firm preservation of Orthodox Christianity, unrestricted Russian autocracy and nationalism."<sup>29</sup> Just before the dissolution of the first Duma the Chief Council of the League made up a so-called "List of 43," enumerating individuals who were to be subject to immediate extermination. Among these were Count Witte, whom the League members considered as the author of the constitution, liberal statesmen such as Milyukov and Rodichev, and the most prominent Jewish political and

<sup>27</sup> Count Witte in his reminiscences writes: "The provoking activity of the police department in organizing the pogroms showed clear results in Homel in 1905." See his *Vospominaniya* (Berlin 1922) vol. ii, p. 71-73, 75.

<sup>28</sup> Dubnow, *op. cit.*, vol. iii, p. 138.

<sup>29</sup> *Soyuz russkago naroda*, p. 411.

social leaders, Vinaver, Gruzenberg, Sliozberg, Joseph Hessen, the members of the Duma, Herzenstein, Yolles and others.<sup>80</sup> The last two were soon murdered by paid agents of the League. The tsar himself was not averse to using the members of the League as a support for his throne. On December 23, 1905 he gave a friendly audience to a deputation of the League and said to them: "Unite the Russian people, I count on you!" And after the League members assassinated Herzenstein and Yolles and the Jewish pogroms became their particular specialty, Nicholas was not ashamed to adorn his chest with the badge of the League.

The personal participation of Nicholas II in the antisemitic activities of his government has been recently revealed in the memoirs of Count Kokovtzev, former minister of the treasury and prime minister after the assassination of Stolypin. Kokovtzev relates that soon after the dissolution of the First Duma the prime minister, Stolypin, called together his colleagues to consider "a confidential problem that had worried him for a long time." Stolypin asked whether it might not be worthwhile to remove some of the restrictions against the Jews which "are particularly annoying to the Jewish population of Russia and, being of no real benefit to the Russian population because they are always circumvented by the Jews, they give food only to the revolutionary feelings of the Jewish masses and serve as a stimulus for the most outrageous anti-Russian propaganda on the part of the powerful Jewish center in America."<sup>81</sup> A "Journal of the Council of Ministers" was prepared on this subject with a statement of two opposing opinions, a more liberal opinion presented by the minister of foreign affairs, Izvolski, and a more conservative opinion presented by Schwanebach. The Journal was then presented to the tsar for instructions as to how the problem was to be presented to the legislative assemblies for deliberation. The tsar kept the Journal for a long time and finally returned it on December 10, 1906 with a personal letter to Stolypin. The latter permitted Kokovtzev to make a copy of this letter and it is now reproduced in Kokovtzev's memoirs. This historical document throws a bright light not only on the tsar's views on Jews but on his character in general. Nicholas II wrote as follows to his prime minister: "I return to you the Journal of the Council of the Ministers on the Jewish problem without my confirmation. In spite of the quite convincing reasons in favor of an

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 86.

<sup>81</sup> Kokovtzev, V. N., *Iz moyego proshlogo, 1903-1919* (Reminiscences of My Past, 1903-1919) (Paris 1933) vol. I, p. 236.

affirmative solution, in this case my inner voice more urgently tells me not to take this decision upon myself. Up to this time my conscience has never misled me. That is why in this case too I am inclined to follow its commands. I know you also believe that 'a tsar's heart is in the hands of God.' Be it so. I carry the great responsibility before God for all my appointees and I am ready at any time in all that to give account to Him."<sup>32</sup>

The "inner voice" whispered to the tsar's heart to abstain from mitigating the government repression of the Jews. The tsar's servants would not be servants of the tsar if they did not know how to grasp his views and plans. And Stolypin, during the entire period of his power, far from attempting to soften the restrictions against the Jews became more inhuman toward them than before. The "Right of Settlement" of Jews became more restricted, they were expelled from cities, the *numerus clausus* for Jewish students was decreased still more, Jewish schools were closed and the development of Jewish national self-assertion was restrained. This antisemitic policy of the government was supported also by the majority of the members of the nationalist, conservative and antisemitic Third Duma. Well could N. M. Fridman, one of the two Jewish deputies in the Third Duma, declare in February, 1910: "In the hardest times that the Jews lived through during the rule of Minister Plehve there was never so much cruelty and bestiality as is practised at the present time."<sup>33</sup>

The tsar's autocratic government refused to consider any friendly pleas in behalf of the Jews. The lawlessness reached not only Russian Jews but also Jews of other countries who found themselves temporarily within the tsar's domains. In 1911 Sir Herbert Samuel, a member of the British cabinet, decided to make a trip to Russia and to visit St. Petersburg. As a Jew, he was obliged to procure a special permit for such a visit. After this special restriction for him as a Jew became known to him, Sir Herbert abandoned the idea of the trip. In the United States a similar situation resolved itself not into an individual but an official protest. Restrictions against American Jews reflected unfavorably on the interests of American trade and industry and at the end of November, 1911 the House of Representatives passed, by a vote of 300 to 1, a resolution to abrogate the trade pact with Russia of 1832, in view of the fact that the Russian government restricted Jewish citizens of the United States in rights belonging to

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 238-39.

<sup>33</sup> Dubnow, *Evreii v Rosii*, p. 79.

them under the American constitution. This resolution was unanimously adopted by the Senate.<sup>34</sup>

During the reign of Nicholas II came also the most notorious of all ritual murder trials, that of Mendel Beilis in 1913. In this case all the forces revolving around the Jewish problem in Russia came to the fore. The government ministers used all their energies to have Beilis convicted and the real murderers of the young Andrey Yushchinski, members of a band of thieves known to the police, evade trial and investigation. The official paper of The League of the Russian People, the *Russkoye Znamya* (Russian Banner), which was very close to government circles, thus formulated the issues of the trial: "The government's duty is to consider the Jews as a nation just as dangerous for the life of humanity as wolves, scorpions, snakes, poisonous spiders and other creatures which are doomed to destruction because of their rapaciousness towards human beings and whose annihilation is commended by law. . . . The *Zhids* must be put in such conditions that they will gradually die out."<sup>35</sup>

The case was given a scientific staging. The prosecution falsified the medico-legal evidence; the police department, with the tsar's knowledge and sanction, remunerated the zeal of the necessary experts; the ministry of justice took care of the selection of suitable jurymen in order to insure for the government the necessary verdict of guilty. The chief organizer and lawyer of Beilis' defense concluded his speech in court by addressing not the jury but the defendant: "It is possible, Beilis, that you will go to perdition innocently. What can we do? It is hardly more than 200 years since your forefathers, on similar accusations, perished at the stake. Resignedly, with prayers on their lips they went to their unjust execution. Why should you be better than they? You must proceed the same way. Your destruction is horrible, but still more horrible is the possibility itself of such accusations to occur here, under the shelter of reason, conscience and law."<sup>36</sup>

<sup>34</sup> *Congressional Record*, vol. xlviii, part i, p. 311-353, and part xii, p. 698-703. On December 16, 1911, the U. S. ambassador in Petersburg, Guild, cabled to the Secretary of State, P. C. Knox, that the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs Sazonov during an interview declared "not cynically but seriously, that he was prepared to consider an arrangement by which the United States might co-operate for the transfer of all Jews from Russia to the United States. He said that Russian experience was that their presence in Russia was a perpetual menace not only to the integrity of the Empire, but to law and order." See *Papers Relating to Foreign Relations, 1911* (Washington 1918) p. 696-97.

<sup>35</sup> See Tager, A. S., *The Decay of Czarism* (Philadelphia 1935). Tager reproduces in this work the exceptionally interesting correspondence of the Russian ministers Kokovtsev, Shcheglovitov, Makarov, Sazonov and others.

<sup>36</sup> Gruzenberg, O., *op. cit.*, p. 114.

The progressive elements in Russian society were highly indignant over this slander on Jews. The most prominent Russian writers, scientists and political leaders, Korolenko, Gorky, Merezhkovski, Sologub, Leonid Andreyev, Alexander Block, Chirikov, Maxim Kovalevski, Milyukov, Kareyev, Arsenyev, Semevski, Petrunkevich, Rodichev, Nabokov and others signed a proclamation which said: "Again an unbelievable lie is thrown into the masses about Jews using Christian blood. This is the well-known way of old fanaticism. . . . In this lie resounds the same hatred that once upon a time threw the dark heathen mob on the first followers of the Christian faith. Not so long ago in China the same story about the use of children's blood, put in circulation by the priests against the missionaries, resulted in several hundred local Christian Europeans losing their lives."<sup>37</sup> Similar indignation was aroused by the Beilis case among the eminent representatives of culture in Western Europe and America. Jaurès, Bonar Law, Brentano, Gerhart Hauptmann, Anatole France, Aulard, Ségnobos, Masaryk, Leroy Beaulieu and others all raised their voices in protest against the tsarist government.

All the efforts and expense of the government were in vain and did not bring the desired result. Even the packed jury gave Beilis a verdict of not guilty. In this way public opinion, through the jury, openly pronounced guilty the accusers of Beilis and the organizers of the trial, which meant the government itself. Gruzenberg, the leading attorney for Beilis, well remarks in his recently published memoirs that "the monarchical regime of Russia committed moral suicide in the Beilis case." Physically the autocracy was killed by the World War. But before it finally disappeared from the scene of history it was able once more to pollute the Russian and international atmosphere with the poisonous emanations of a new slander and new calumny directed against the Jews.

The coming of the war in 1914 brought additional hardships to Russian Jewry. Wounded Jewish soldiers who happened to be outside the pale were sent back to the restricted area. Scant recognition was given to Jews who distinguished themselves in the fighting. The Jewish communities of Kurland and Kovno as well as of other provinces on the front were expelled and transferred to other parts of the country. Military courts were particularly severe in cases where Jews were involved. The practise of taking prominent Jews as hostages was widely used. Pogroms came with the retreat of the Russian armies in Galicia, Poland and

<sup>37</sup> Lozinski, S., *Sotsialnye korni antisemitizma* (The Social Roots of Antisemitism) (Rostov 1929) p. 202.

Lithuania in the summer and autumn of 1915. Particularly harmful was the dissemination by the government of charges of treason and espionage against the Jewish people as a whole. Such charges in particular were bound to provoke and aggravate the sentiment of ill feeling towards the Jews in the army and in the nation at large.

The official version concerning "Jewish espionage" was also dictated by practical purposes: to mask, at least partially, the lack of ability and criminal unpreparedness for war of the central administration and the military command. Thus, in an order to the armies of the fortified district of Novogeorgievsk the Jews were denounced as "faithful allies of the enemies of Russia." On the streets of Lemberg and other cities in Galicia placards in Polish and German were placed in full view which read: "In order to free . . . our armies from espionage, which the Jews practise on our whole front, the Commander-in-Chief forbids the Jews to reside in the area of the army and to enter in the area west of the city of Yaroslavl. Also in order to prevent cases of slandering the peaceful population and to discover the espionage of the Jews, he ruled that hostages should be taken, who are to be punished (execution by hanging). For each peaceful inhabitant who will be denounced to the enemy authorities and also for each captured Jewish spy two Jewish hostages will be responsible." This is only one of the numerous illustrations of that last word that the dying autocratic government addressed to its Jewry, deprived of all rights.<sup>38</sup>

\* \* \* \*

The history of antisemitism in tsarist Russia cannot be reproduced and understood only as a result of economic relations and social struggles of different classes. Of course economics and social contradictions, just as psychological habits and religious dissensions, had their influence on the forms, character, dimensions and intensity which antisemitism assumed at different times and under different circumstances. But just because Imperial Russia in the whole course of its two hundred years of history was and remained autocratic Russia, the personal policy, psychology and world conception of the autocrat provided the imprint for antisemitism in Russia.

<sup>38</sup> See "Iz chiornoi knigi rosiiskago evreistva" (From the Black Book of Russian Jewry) in *Evreiskaya starina*, vol. x (1918) 195-296, particularly p. 219, 251, 264. Included here are also a number of notes compiled by M. M. Vinaver, S. M. Dubnow, D. O. Zaslavski and G. M. Erlich on subjects pertaining to the situation of the Russian Jews during the war years.

## ANTISEMITISM IN POLAND

BY RAPHAEL MAHLER

There is an anecdote current among American Jews of Eastern European origin which illustrates their view of Polish antisemitism. The story tells of a Jewish innkeeper who, during the Polish insurrection of 1863, risked his own life to save the life of a Polish nobleman who had taken refuge in the Jew's cellar. On bringing down some food to the cellar the Jew forgetfully failed to uncover his head before the nobleman. The Polish aristocrat flew into a rage, stamped his feet and shouted, "Take off your hat, you dirty Jew!" (Neither the source nor the historical accuracy of this anecdote has been verified but the social historian may well apply here the proverb: *Se non è vero, è ben trovato*.<sup>1</sup> Even if the story does not reflect the fundamental attitude of most of the Polish people towards the Jews, it does reflect the picture which Jews themselves have drawn of the special character of Polish antisemitism.

The character of antisemitism in a given country can be explained only in terms of the specific social, economic and political forces operating within that country. Racial, religious or mystical theories of antisemitism are inadequate to explain the peculiar developments in individual countries. An analysis of the special character of Polish antisemitism, therefore, must be related to the social and economic evolution of the country and to the special role of the Jews in Polish history.

### I

During the Middle Ages antisemitic outbreaks in Poland came at a later date and were comparatively weaker than in Central Europe. This was due largely to the retarded development of the country. The early Jewish immigrants into Poland from the West were engaged chiefly in moneylending and, to a lesser extent, in commerce. Jewish moneylenders played an important role in the economic development of the backward country. The landed nobility required money to develop intensive agri-

<sup>1</sup> Yeheskiel Kotik asserts in his memoirs (*Maine zikhroines*, Berlin 1922, vol. i, p. 271) that incidents such as the one mentioned in this anecdote were frequent during the Polish insurrection of 1863.

culture on their large estates, and they received their loans mainly from Jews. The rise of towns in the 13th and 14th centuries also stimulated the need for more capital, which could be supplied chiefly by Jews. This need for capital in the economically undeveloped Poland was the chief reason that the rulers of Poland encouraged Jewish immigration and granted them protection and unlimited rights of trade.

The chief disseminator of antisemitism in Poland during this period was the Catholic Church. In Poland in particular the Church was fearful of possible religious influence by Jews on the Christians. The fear of spreading heresies came as a result of the comparatively late development of Christianity in Poland and the greater chance, therefore, of heretical sects like the Waldensians taking hold among the people. (This motive is clearly revealed in a declaration by the synod of the Polish church in 1267 in Breslau (at that time a Polish city). The synod demanded the strict segregation of Jews from Christians through the creation of separate Jewish sections in the towns. The reason advanced was that "the Polish land is a new part of the Christian organism," that there was danger "lest the Christians become infected with the superstitions and evil practices of the Jews," and "in order that the Christian faith be sooner and more easily inculcated into the hearts of the faithful.") The only recorded assaults on Jews in Poland before the middle of the 14th century come within the category of antisemitism disseminated by the Church. (They have to do with attacks on Jews by schoolboys during the reign of Mieczyslaw III at the close of the 12th century. These assaults, however, can hardly be considered as reflecting any antisemitic feelings of the population as a whole. At the very same time coins were circulating in Poland bearing Hebrew inscriptions stamped by the Jewish keepers of the mint.)

A change in the situation came about in the second half of the 14th century with the development of towns. The Polish merchant class became strong enough to attempt a struggle against their Jewish competitors. At the same time legal restrictions on their activity as moneylenders turned the Jews more and more to commercial pursuits.<sup>2</sup> Thus was initiated the struggle between the Polish merchants and the Jews, a

<sup>2</sup>Through mortgage loans Jews frequently had come into possession of large estates and even of entire villages. The Polish nobility, however, was anxious to bar other classes of the population from free ownership of land. Thus the same law of 1423, which empowered the noblemen to dismiss the village bailiffs from their offices in order to deprive them of their landed property, also forbade Jews to lend money on mortgage.



struggle which has continued up to the present day and which has been the main source of antisemitism in Poland.

(The record of anti-Jewish outbreaks in Poland during the 14th and 15th centuries testifies clearly to the economic character of the prevailing antisemitism. The first pogroms are recorded briefly in a chronicle of 1349 without any indication as to the localities in which the excesses took place. In 1367 there was a pogrom in Poznan, in the most westerly and economically most developed part of Poland. Pogroms are frequently recorded during the 15th century in Poznan as well as in Cracow. In the eastern part of Poland, however, the first anti-Jewish riots do not occur until 1498 in the city of Lwow. The more retarded the region, therefore, the later the rise of anti-Jewish activities. It must be said, however, that in eastern Poland the mixed character of the Christian population—Poles, Germans, Ruthenians, Armenians—made it more difficult to create a solid anti-Jewish bloc. Moreover, among the Christians were many schismatics, who were also exposed to the assaults of Catholic fanatics. In 1463 the Polish crusaders, marching against the Turks, plundered Ruthenian heretics together with Jewish infidels.

To be sure, the Church also played its role in the antisemitic movements of the 15th-century Poland. Many outbreaks against Jews were disguised as vengeance for alleged desecration of the host or for the ritual murder of Christian children. The movement against the Hussites as well as the crusades against the Turks also brought further action against the Jews. John Capistrano, who came to Poland in 1454 to lead in the fight against the Hussites and Turks, also incited the population against the Jews and this led to pogroms in several Polish towns. On the other hand, these religious factors would never have been so successful were it not for the economic factor of the growing competition between the Christian merchants and the Jews. The economic background of these pogroms during the second half of the 15th century is substantiated by the fact that all the larger towns of Poland, like Poznan, Cracow, Lwow and Sandomierz, at this time compelled the Jewish communities to conclude "voluntary" agreements whereby the rights of Jewish merchants were limited or, as in the case of Cracow, whereby Jews were excluded from commerce almost entirely.)

## II

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Poland was consolidated

as a state under the dominance of the nobility. The economic backwardness of the country was responsible for the unparalleled weakness of the bourgeoisie, which was not able in consequence to give support to the king in his vain efforts to rescue his political power. The nobility in its turn used its political power to suppress the bourgeoisie and to deprive it even of those meager political rights which it had enjoyed during the Middle Ages. With the exception of a number of the largest cities, the cities and towns in Poland became the property of the nobility or subject to officials of the nobleman.

At the same time the social and economic structure of Polish Jewry was changed. In the cities the occupation of moneylending disappeared almost entirely among the Jews and was replaced by commerce. But the hindrances devised by the Christian city dwellers were severe. Jews were excluded from a number of large cities, except during fairs and market days. In others, limitations were put upon them with regard to retail trade and important articles of merchandise. A great many Jews (by the eighteenth century the number reached half of all Jewish city dwellers) turned to handicraft. Large numbers dispersed in the small towns owned by noblemen, where they were protected by the proprietors from oppression on the part of the Christian inhabitants. Still a larger number of Jews (in the eighteenth century this number amounted to one-third of the whole Jewish population of Poland) settled in the villages owned exclusively by the nobility. The village Jews were occupied for the most part as innkeepers and as stewards of the noblemen's mills, breweries, distilleries, dairy farms, bridge tolls and the like. A considerable number of Jews, ~~especially in Ruthenia and in the Ukraine~~, managed to farm entire villages from the landowners, thus getting the power of ruling over the peasants. The political status of the Jews in Poland underwent changes corresponding to the growing social and political power of the nobility. Instead of being subjected only to the king and his highest officials, the majority of Jews, living now in the small towns and villages, became, like the peasants, subjects of the noblemen.

(Polish antisemitic literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries similarly reflects the hostility of the bourgeoisie. Almost all the authors of the numerous anti-Jewish pamphlets came from the urban classes. There were no noblemen among them. The most prominent of these authors, Sebastyan Miczynski, wrote his "Mirror of the Polish Crown," to all appearances, upon the commission of the town council of Cracow.

The arguments used in most of these pamphlets deal with religious charges against the Jews but they center around the economic competition of the Jews. The mere fact that Jews are engaged in commerce is a crime in the eyes of these antisemites since "they take the trade away from the city," i.e., from the Christian merchants. The Jews, it is alleged, are more successful because of their connections with merchants in adjacent countries, through their organization of networks of branches throughout the country and because of their being content with lower profits. We see here an attack upon Jewish merchants not only as competitors but also as pioneers of more rationalistic forms of capitalist organization—manifestations which down through the 19th century are attacked as "Jewish perfidy and slyness."

Another field in which Jewish competition caused resentment was that of handicraft. Here too the mere participation of Jews as tailors, furriers, hatmakers, goldsmiths and the like was sufficient to arouse the indignation of the non-Jewish artisans. Jews, along with non-Catholic Christians, were excluded from the craft guilds. But the Jews, as the more recent newcomers to these fields, were viewed with greater hostility than the others. The more experienced Christian artisan looked disdainfully upon the work of the Jewish artisans as shoddy and unqualified. The term "Jewish work" became for centuries a synonym for cheap and trashy work. In reality the "cheap work" was rather the result of the new system of organization of handicraft. The Jewish artisans, excluded from the guilds, started the production of standard articles for sale and thus they became the promoters of the capitalistic commercialization-process of industry in Poland. The Polish artisan also had reason for hostility to the Jewish merchants. Jewish merchants often had a monopoly control over the trade in raw materials needed by the artisans, such as skins, furs and the like. In many cases, too, there was competition between the Christian artisans and the Jewish merchants who imported from outside commodities such as shoes and clothing. As pioneers of a more advanced economic system the Jews were thus hated even more by the artisans than by the non-Jewish merchants. In all the anti-Jewish riots of the 17th century as well as in later centuries, the most active groups were recruited largely from the artisan class, particularly journeymen and apprentices. These groups, more backward socially and culturally, were used by the merchant patricians as tools in all these outbreaks, not only against the Jews but also against the heretics.

In this bourgeois antisemitism of the 17th century one group of professionals also begins to play a role, the physicians. (One of the most insidious anti-Jewish pamphlets of the 17th century was written by a Polish physician, Sleszkowski, and directed against Jewish doctors as alleged quacks.)

The attitude of the peasantry towards the Jews during this period is more difficult to gauge. Being for the most part illiterate, we find no record of their sentiments in the literature of the time. Nor is it safe to make any deductions from the bloody events of 1648 in the Ukraine during the uprising of Chmielnicki. Conditions in the Ukraine differed in many ways from those in other parts of Poland; here and there were numerous Jews to whom entire estates had been farmed out and who ruled over the peasants with all the authority of the landlords. As for the Jewish innkeepers, their lower standard of living, their rustic life and, above all, the oppression which they too endured at the hands of the landlords, all tended to soften the antagonism between them and the peasants. The peasants' hostility toward the Jewish urban merchants and craftsmen was no sharper than toward the Christian city dwellers, since the Jews contented themselves with a lower profit rate.)

The nobility as a whole was not antagonistic to the Jews, who served their interests in many ways. They acted as a means to checkmate the political growth of the bourgeoisie. The Jews were economically indispensable to the noblemen in the management of their estates, as innkeepers, as middlemen between them and the peasants, as brokers and agents, as commercial specialists supplying them with necessary commodities and cash, and transacting for them the sale of their agricultural products. The proverb which circulated in old Poland, "Each landlord has his Jew," is expressive of this situation. It would be wrong, however, to overlook differences in attitude towards the Jews among the different strata of the noble class. The group of big landowners derived the most profit from the Jews. They farmed out to the Jews the tolls and industrial and commercial establishments and were never in a position of rivalry with them. They were eager to have Jews settle in their towns in order to stimulate the development of commerce and handicrafts. Even in cities where the establishment of Jews was forbidden entirely (Warsaw, Wilno), or confined to special sections and suburbs (Cracow, Lublin), the Jews were able to circumvent the prohibitions by living in the palaces and mansions of the magnates. Since the estates of the magnates were

free from the jurisdiction of the cities, the Jews were able to open stores, inns and shops, paying high sums for rent as well as for protection. The antisemitic literature of that period mentions expressly the "grand Polish lords as the protectors of the Jews to the detriment of the Poles." The lesser nobility derived most of their profit from the Jews by employing them as innkeepers. This group too had no antagonistic interests with regard to the Jews, except insofar as it resented the role of the Jews in increasing the power of the magnates. The petty nobility (owners of small farms of landless noblemen) were antagonistic toward the Jews for distinct economic reasons. They begrudged the positions held by the Jews in the large estates, since they themselves aspired to these sources of income.

It was the nobility, however, who gave to 17th century Polish anti-semitism its specific character and psychological coloring. For although the nobleman needed the Jew for his economic activities he, at the same time, despised him and looked upon him as a contemptible being. (The rigidly exclusive character of the Polish noble caste, which was more sharply drawn than in any other European country, developed among the Polish nobles a contempt for all other classes of society. But the Jews were despised even more than the "lower" Christian classes. Moreover, the religion of the Jew, the "enemy of Christ," accentuated this hatred. The nobility considered itself as the chief guardian of the faith. Their battles against the Moslems, Tartars and Turks were reflected also in their attitude towards the infidels at home, the Jews.)

(Inspiration as well as arguments were supplied to these various groups hostile to the Jews by the Church and above all by the members of the Jesuit order. Poland witnessed a wave of religious fanaticism which began at the close of the 16th century and reached its high point in the 18th century. This fanaticism was directed at first towards Protestants and members of the Greek Orthodox Church but it led inevitably also to severe intolerance of the Jews. The anti-Jewish riots, frequent in the 17th century, were arranged by students of the Jesuit colleges and by other elements in the urban population on the occasion of religious processions and festivals. Numerous ritual murder trials were initiated by the Jesuits in order to keep alive this spirit of religious zeal and intolerance. But in many instances attacks on Jews went hand in hand with assaults upon Protestant sects. The anti-Jewish pamphlets issued by churchmen to demonstrate the "errors" of the Talmud also strike at the Protestants,

"who are not a whit better than the Jews." Riots against Jews often ended with similar attacks upon Lutherans and Calvinists, while profanation of churches and cemeteries of Protestants would often end with pillaging the Jewish sections. It is interesting to note too that Protestants and Jews often resorted to the same defense techniques. Thus, for example, it became customary for Jews to pay gratuities (*kozubalec*) to schoolboys and to sextons of churches in order to be free from assault while passing through the streets in which religious institutions were located. The Protestant "heretics" followed the Jewish example and we find that as early as the beginning of the 17th century they too came to pay the students the humiliating taxes for free passage, for the free conduct of their funeral processions and the like.<sup>3</sup>)

The dire poverty of the Jewish masses in Poland is another element in the picture of 17th century Polish antisemitism. (This fact is conceded by most of the authors of antisemitic literature.) But Jewish poverty merely serves as an excuse for gibing and mocking the Jews. In their religious zeal to convert the Jews they do not fail to point to the poverty of the Jews to demonstrate that they are abominable and forgotten by their Messiah, for whom they continue to wait in vain. Often too the Jews are described as miserly in their zeal to save their money rather than expend it for better living. (Thus the Polish poet Jarzemski in 1643 writes of the Jews of Warsaw:

"Miserly in his life:  
What clothing! Enter his house  
And behold! He gnaws at his little radish,  
His little cucumber and carrot  
And thus contented is the dirty Jew  
While he gathers the coins, the ugly fellow. . . ."<sup>4</sup>)

### III

All the social conflicts which ~~we have seen to~~ constitute the sources of antisemitism in Poland in the 17th century became intensified in the 18th century, particularly at its close. The Jewish question emerged as a leading social and political problem during the period of the ~~the~~ Quadrennial Diet (1778-92) when the representatives of the nobility were faced with

<sup>3</sup>Sobiecki, Wacław, *Nienawiść wyznaniowa tłumów za rządów Zygmunta IIIgo* (Warsaw 1902) p. 162. These historical facts refute the theories regarding the alleged unique psychology of antisemitic persecutions and the unique "inferiority complex" to be found among Jews as a persecuted social group.

<sup>4</sup>Bartoszewicz, K., *Antysemityzm w literaturze polskiej xv-xviii w.* (Warsaw 1914) p. 194.

the task of dealing with the urgent problems confronting the country after the first partition. The major social problem in the rural areas was that of raising the standard of living of the peasant class, who made up about 80 percent of the population. As for the towns, there was the question of the status of the townsmen, who had thus far not possessed any political rights and who did not enjoy any degree of self-government. The Jewish problem was closely linked to both these questions. (One of the chief causes of the miserable condition of the Polish peasants was their habitual drunkenness, and the Jewish innkeepers in the peasant villages were deeply involved in this situation. To remedy the situation the innkeeper system would have had to be abolished and the numerous Jews thus employed would have had to find a place in agriculture, commerce or handicrafts. This in turn was bound up with the question of granting political rights to the Polish burghers. There was serious danger that the Polish bourgeoisie once having gotten political power, would use it not only to bar from the cities any influx of declassed Jewish innkeepers but even to deprive those Jews already long established in the cities of all their economic rights.)

The abundant political literature of this period reflects the attitude of the various social and economic groups in Poland towards the Jews. The majority of the nobility, consisting of minor landholders, displayed an attitude that was even more hostile than in the preceding century. (They were opposed to any program of abolition of socage, which would mean the loss to them of a cheap source of agricultural labor; in order to divert attention from their selfish aims these noblemen sought to place all the blame for the dire poverty of the peasants upon the shoulders of the Jewish innkeepers. In the larger cities the majority of the nobility was quite willing to deliver the Jews to the mercy of their Christian competitors at the price of the mitigation of their political demands. This policy was carried out in part in the Constitution of May 3, 1791. In practise, however, there were not many radical changes in the Jewish status. The Jewish innkeepers were retained as middlemen for squeezing out the profits from the peasants, and except for some of the larger royal towns, the Jews in the private cities and towns remained unimpaired in their economic activities. This practical conservatism of the nobility was due in a large measure to the indebtedness of the Jewish communities. The noblemen were afraid of losing their loans invested in the Jews if the Jews were eliminated completely from their traditional occupations.)

The most tolerant and humane attitude of the period was displayed by the members of the higher nobility. This group was as a whole more enlightened than the lesser nobility. But their economic interests also coincided with a more favorable attitude towards the Jews. The higher nobles were not opposed to the abolition of the socage system of peasant labor; they were interested in having these obligations converted into fixed money rents. Although they too favored the abolition of the inn-keeper system, they did not attribute the dire poverty of the peasants to this system as much as to the socage system. The program of these noblemen with regard to the Jewish question, as found in the pamphlets of Thaddeus Czacki, Butrymowicz and an anonymous writer, consisted of the following points: a part of the Jewish population should be settled as tenant farmers, the Jews in the cities should not be restricted in their pursuits of trade and handicraft, they should enjoy to some extent the rights of citizenship and should be admitted to limited membership in the merchant and craft guilds. These writers were the first in the history of Poland to advocate publicly a policy of mutual understanding between "two nations on one soil" and to proclaim freely the true situation of the Jews in Poland. The author of the anonymous pamphlet of 1782 thus summarizes the status of the Jews in Poland at the time:

The Jews are excluded from all classes of the country, they are encircled by special laws, they are barred from the honors of citizenship, they are compelled to pay double fees in the courts, their religion is a laughing stock and a prey to vilification—and still the Jew is requested to carry his fetters with reverence, to kiss the hands which put him in irons. . . . He does not want to settle on the land because he does not want to change the character of his misery; he is idle<sup>5</sup> and poor but he is not a serf. . . . He is fervently willing to go into trade and industry, but the cities either do not admit him at all or permit him only to become a hawker. He is forbidden to perfect himself in handicrafts and arts and he is barred from the guilds and municipalities. The Jew, pressed by the necessity of earning his livelihood, has bargained with the city dweller and bought from him various concessions. Mutual agreements were concluded, which couldn't be lasting and could not be strictly adhered to. Protectors were found—each part destroyed the other and havoc was wrought on our trade and our cities.<sup>6</sup>)

<sup>5</sup> The author, like many of his contemporaries in Poland, was evidently an adherent of the physiocratic school, according to which only agriculture produces economic wealth. Besides, many Jewish activities, such as those of brokers, agents and innkeepers, were considered at that time as sheer idleness.

<sup>6</sup> Balaban, M., *Historja i literatura żydowska* (Warsaw 1925) vol. iii, p. 414.



The Polish bourgeoisie, the main antisemitic class in the country since the 15th century, took advantage of the occasion of an open discussion on the Jewish problem in the period of reforms, to start a violent campaign against the Jews. The contrast between Poland and the Western European countries is particularly apparent in this respect. Poland was far behind the countries of Western Europe in its economic development. Even by the close of the 18th century there was no strong class of upper bourgeoisie in Poland. Moreover, whereas in Western Europe the Jewish bourgeoisie constituted only a small percentage of the entire class, the proportion in Poland was quite different. The Jewish townspeople in Poland were numerically stronger than the Christian inhabitants in the towns. (The Jewish urban population has been estimated as about 600,000 (two-thirds of the 900,000 Polish Jews at the time) as compared with about 500,000 non-Jews.) Unlike the bourgeois classes of Western Europe, therefore, the Polish bourgeoisie was too weak to come out with a program of full emancipation and equal political rights for all sections of the population. It contented itself merely with demands for the restitution of self-government for the cities and with the extension to city dwellers of such political rights as the right of representation in the diet and of eligibility to some of the higher public offices. The "radicalism" of the Polish bourgeoisie was displayed only in its attitude towards the Jews.

(In the political pamphlets of bourgeois writers the Jews are pictured as the cause of Poland's misery and particularly of the ruination of Polish commerce and industry. Even a statesman like the priest Staszyc applies to the Jews such epithets as "the plague," "the winter and summer locust of the country," "idlers," "contagion," "putridness," and the like. The demands of these writers aimed at the elimination of Jewish competition in commerce and handicraft. A favorite slogan of such writers called for the settlement of Jews as peasants on private and state lands. As for the status of Jews in the cities there were variations in the program by different authors. The extreme antisemites demanded the absolute elimination of Jews from the cities with the expelled Jews to become peasants or to be used as laborers on public works. Other writers urged the establishment of special Jewish towns, arguing that in this way the Jews would not interfere with the Christian artisans. Even the moderates, who admitted the right of the Jews to engage in commerce and crafts in the cities, demanded that the Jews be placed under the full jurisdiction of the munici-

<sup>1</sup> Korzon, T., *Wewnętrzne dzieje Polski za Stanisława Augusta* (Warsaw 1897) vol. i, p. 320.

pal authorities and guilds without any participation in the rights of the Christian citizens. As for cities like Warsaw and many others, which possessed the old privilege *de non tolerandis Judaeis*, this privilege was to be carried out by the expulsion of all Jews already settled there.<sup>8)</sup>

The Jewish question was not solved by the old Polish state because the fundamental social questions were not solved and because the status of the peasants, the primary cause of economic decay, was not changed in any way. It was also the economic stagnation and the social disease of old Poland which contributed to the political weakness of the state and caused the partition of the country between its three neighboring powers.

#### IV

The Jewish question in partitioned Poland in the 19th and 20th centuries was a reflection of the still unsolved fundamental social question of the problem of the peasantry, and with it the retarded economic, political and cultural development of the country. (The constitution bestowed upon the Duchy of Warsaw in 1807 by Napoleon did not change essentially the legal status of the peasants. Formally the comprehensive law (*l'esclavage est abolit*) freed the peasant from being attached to the soil but in practise he was hardly able to enjoy this freedom, burdened as he remained with most of the feudal obligations. It was not until the middle of the 19th century in Galicia and the year 1864 in the kingdom of Poland that the peasants were enfranchised and the land held by them bestowed upon them as their property. Although these acts changed the legal status of the peasants, their social condition was not improved. For some years it became even worse since the burden of the indemnity to the landlords was a new additional cause of poverty. Poland never experienced an agrarian reform introduced by revolutionary force or by governmental decrees.) The unparalleled poverty of the peasants, who even in the 20th century constituted more than three-quarters of the population, was the main hindrance to the normal capitalistic development of Poland. The extremely low purchasing power of the population did not render possible the growth of industry and trade. Notwithstanding some advances in industry and trade during the 19th century

<sup>8</sup> The economic motive of competition as decisive in all these programs is corroborated by the attitude of the same antisemitic authors toward the neophytes. As a result of the Frankist movement several hundred Jews became converted to Christianity. Many of the neophytes settled in Warsaw as merchants and innkeepers. In many antisemitic pamphlets of that time the neophytes were attacked with the same vehemence as the Jews as "taking away the bread from Christians."

Poland continued to remain an agrarian country dominated by the landed aristocracy. As the former Polish secretary of treasury, Ignacy Matuszewski declared, "There never was a 19th century in Poland."<sup>9</sup> And many features of the antisemitic mentality in Poland in the 19th and even in the 20th century appear due to this "lack of the 19th century" in that country.)

The statement of Karl Marx that "the dominant culture of an epoch is the culture of the dominant class of that epoch" may be safely applied to Polish antisemitism. The contemptuous attitude of the nobility toward the Jew was unparalleled in any other country. This attitude in turn influenced to a large extent the stand taken towards the Jews by the antisemitic elements among the other social classes. In the case of the bourgeoisie there was even more direct transference of these attitudes. (The bourgeoisie of Poland was filled in the second half of the 19th century with impoverished noblemen who, after the liberation of the serfs, could not adjust themselves to the new conditions and turned to commerce and industry. Moreover, in the parts of Poland occupied by Prussia and Russia government posts came to be filled by Prussian and Russian officials instead of Polish noblemen, thus throwing many more of the Polish nobility into trade and industry. In these more direct ways, therefore, the arrogant antisemitic attitude of the nobility was imparted to the bourgeoisie.)

The social dominance of the nobility was to a large extent responsible for the difficulties encountered by the Jews of Poland in their struggle for political rights in the 19th century. The class conceit of the Polish nobility was revealed in their attitude towards Jews serving in the army and holding public office. (When during the Polish November insurrection of 1831, the issue of calling Jews to the colors was debated in the diet, the war minister, Francis Morawski, appealed most fervently to the traditions of Polish "chivalry" not to admit the Jews to military service. "It would pain a Pole to recollect," he said, "that in this struggle he couldn't dispense with the help of the people of Israel."<sup>10</sup> This attitude was strongly opposed by many deputies and ridiculed by the democratic faction but the motion was upheld by the overwhelming majority of the diet. Still more inconceivable to the mentality of a nobleman was the possibility of a Jew holding public office in Poland. Even the most pro-

<sup>9</sup> Matuszewski, Ignacy, *Próby syntez* (Warsaw 1937) p. 196.

<sup>10</sup> Schipper, L., *Zydzi królestwa Polskiego w dobie powstania listopadowego* (Warsaw 1932) p. 169.

gressive writers on the Jewish question in the first half of the 19th century never went so far as to demand this political right for the Jews.)

Together with the social and economic backwardness of Poland in the 19th and 20th centuries there persisted an attitude towards commerce reflecting the agricultural character of the country. Despite some capitalistic development the overwhelming majority of the Polish people still regarded commercial occupations with mistrust. Trade was identified with swindle, trickery and deceit. But the relative majority of the Jews in Poland during the entire period before the first World War was engaged in commerce and more than two-thirds of all the people engaged in such vocations were Jews. Petty trade was dominated to an even larger extent by Jews. Under such circumstances it is apparent why the Jew came to be associated in the minds of so many of the people with the idea of a swindler.

(The "absence of the 19th century" in Poland is revealed also in the fact that the country never passed through a political revolution such as was experienced by the Western European states. There never was a strong bourgeois political liberalism with its own party and platform of political democracy. Instead the new Polish bourgeoisie, faced by the socialist movement of the 19th century, joined with the reactionary elements in the country headed by the big landlords and the clergy.

The traditional religious intolerance and fanaticism persisted among the overwhelming majority of the population. It extended even to a part of the industrial workers in the cities who, recruited from the villages, still retained the religious fanaticism of the village. The socialist movement in the latter part of the 19th and in the 20th century served to counteract this tendency among the workers.)

A very important factor which contributed to the special character of Polish antisemitism relates to the national and cultural separateness of the Jewish population in Poland. The majority of the Polish Jews have to this day preserved their traditional cultural and religious patterns of life. The strict observance of all the minutiae of orthodox Judaism, such as the dietary laws, Sabbath regulations and the like, prevented free social intercourse between Jews and non-Jews. Specific customs, dress and language all served to isolate the Jewish group and widen the gap between the two peoples. The Jews spoke their own Yiddish language and only a minority acquired a thorough knowledge of the Polish language. This fact supplied Polish antisemites with additional material

for inciting hatred against the "strangers" in the land. (The attitude of the Polish population toward the Yiddish language differed from that displayed toward any other non-Polish language. It was the language of a national-religious group which was placed on the lowest rung in the social hierarchy of the country. The contempt displayed toward the innkeeper, small storekeeper, peddler, broker and agent was thus carried over to the language spoken by them. The Yiddish language sounded comic and ridiculous to the semi-intelligent elements in the population, as ridiculous as was the appearance of the Jewish factotum to the haughty Polish nobleman. Secondly, as the Yiddish language was spoken "for internal use" by a group dispersed among the Polish population, it was regarded as a sign of obstinate clannishness, marked by a kind of group-conspiracy, like the slang used by elements beyond the margin of society, such as thieves, beggars and the like.)

The intensity of the Jewish national individuality in Poland was due to a large extent to the numerical strength of the Jewish population and to their concentration in compact areas. Poland had the largest number of Jews of all the countries in Europe. Before the second World War there were about three and one-quarter million Jews in Poland, constituting about ten percent of the entire population. (Even more significant was their relationship to the urban population of the country. Until recently the Jews constituted about one-third of the city dwellers in central Poland. This concentration in small towns and in separate sections of the large cities (like Warsaw, Lodz, Wilno, Cracow and Lwow was most favorable to the flourishing of a Jewish national life)

The peculiar exclusiveness of the Polish Jews was also rooted in the general backwardness of the country, with the preponderance of agriculture and small town life and with the political oppression of the Jews. The religious fanaticism of the Jews was but a counterpart to the religious fanaticism of the great majority of the Christian population. (There was a tendency for many of these negative and backward aspects of Jewish exclusiveness to disappear with the progressive development of the country and, on the other hand, the maintenance of Jewish national identity was not in contradiction to the progress of the country as a whole. This fact was recognized by many Polish socialists and by liberal writers like Prof. Baudouin de Courtenay.) The organized anti-semitic elements, ~~however,~~ took advantage of the fact that due to special geographical and historical circumstances Jewish national life flourished

in Poland to an extent unparalleled in Western or Central Europe and misrepresented the national character of the Jews in Poland as a constituent part of their negative exclusiveness.

All the above-mentioned factors, however, were not sufficient in themselves to arouse an active antisemitic movement. The interests of the peasants, who constituted the overwhelming majority of the Polish population, did not conflict so violently with those of the Jews as to lead them to start a fight against them. (This was all the more so since already at the beginning of the nineteenth century the class of Jewish innkeepers in the villages had disappeared almost entirely, due to legal restrictions (an exception in this respect was Galicia). Laws of the tsarist regime, which were issued later, forbade the Jews to acquire real estate from the peasants. As a result only about 12 percent of Jews in central Poland before the first World War lived in the villages, their main occupation being small store-keeping, cattle trade, dairy farming and the like. The antagonism to the Jewish city dweller, the "swindler," was even more than in the previous centuries greatly weakened by the fact that the Polish tradesmen and handicraftsmen, who increased in number steadily, did not treat the peasant any better than the Jewish tradesmen.) The religious customs and exterior of the Jew appeared less ridiculous to the peasant than to the Polish townsman because he himself clung to his peculiar customs and dress, which were by no means more "European" than the Jewish.

The nobility, while contemptuous in its attitude toward the Jew, as in the previous centuries, did not have any important reasons for hostility against them. (In addition, the economic "symbiosis" between the nobleman and "his Jew," outlasted to some extent even the nineteenth century; the Jew transacted for his "lord" all the complicated business involved in the sale of agricultural products. The great number of Jews in the country and the role played by them in commerce were, as far as the gentry and peasants were concerned, factors which rather mitigated than enhanced any hostile feelings towards them. The Jews were regarded as a customary, necessary "class" of the population, although isolated from all classes and ridiculous to some of them.) The evident poverty of the majority of the Jewish population was a further factor which weakened the effect of any propaganda inciting hatred of the "Jewish exploiters."

The chief promoters and disseminators of antisemitism during the 19th century were found, as in previous centuries, among the bourgeoisie. The economic rivalry between the Polish and Jewish bourgeoisie increased

in intensity. On the one hand there was an increase in the number of Jews in the cities, due to the migration of Jews forced to leave the villages, and on the other hand, the Polish bourgeoisie was strengthened economically and numerically by the steady development of commerce and industry and by the influx into the cities of declassed peasants and noblemen. The antisemitic propaganda of the Polish bourgeoisie continued incessantly during the 19th century except when interrupted by the insurrections for national independence. (The year 1859 witnessed a high point in the campaign of the Polish townspeople against the Jews. So violent were the attacks launched by a section of the Polish press against the Jews that this year has come down in the history of Poland as the year of the "Jewish War." A controversy now raged over the question of equal civic rights for the Jews. Some of the progressive elements in Polish society, representing a small group of bigger merchants and industrialists, realized that the economic development of the country was incompatible with the maintenance of restrictions upon the Jews such as limitations of residence, exclusion from craft and merchant guilds, restrictions on acquiring real estate, special taxes like the kosher meat tax and the like. They argued too that enlightened Jews had already shown themselves to be thoroughly attached to Polish culture. In fact, during the first half of the 19th century there had come into existence a new group of Jewish merchants, bankers, industrialists, publishers and professional men who had absorbed Polish culture and who regarded themselves as "Poles of the Old Testament persuasion.") The reactionary petty bourgeoisie feared nothing more than the extension of the rights of citizenship to the Jews since this would enhance their position in their competition in the field of commerce and handicrafts. Diverting attention from their real motives they violently attacked the assimilated "Jewish autocracy" as damaging the country by its economic activities and exercising a detrimental influence on Polish cultural life.

(The insurrection of January, 1863 brought about a standstill in antisemitic agitation for several years. The Jewish bourgeoisie and intellectuals displayed such fervent patriotism in supporting the uprising by agitation, material aid and personal participation in the struggle, that even the most malignant antisemites were compelled to express their admiration. The idealism of the Jewish patriots, moreover, was the more above question since just on the eve of the outbreak of the struggle all the most oppressive special restrictions on the Jews were abolished

by the governor, Wielopolski, the staunch enemy of the national-revolutionary movement. Never before and never since was the friendship, conciliation and brotherhood of "two nations living on one soil" so enthusiastically celebrated as during these years of armed struggle against the Russian oppressor. All the accumulated prejudices toward the Jewish religion, race, customs and peculiarities seemed to dwindle away in face of the necessity to fight the common national enemy. Yet the main source of antisemitism, the competition of the petty bourgeoisie, was far from having disappeared. It was to come forth again to spread anti-Jewish prejudice more than ever in Polish history.)

In the last two decades of the 19th century the economic development of Poland was accelerated and the new capitalistic developments created the same foundations for the spread of antisemitism as did similar developments in Germany and Austria. The fields of activity of the small merchants and handicraftsmen became narrower as they were pushed out more and more by big industry and highly organized business establishments. The increased development of banking, moreover, made the small tradesmen, artisans as well as farmers, dependent on the banks. At the same time the reactionary elements in the new capitalistic classes found it to their advantage to divert the embitterment and exasperation of the petty bourgeoisie from its real sources of trouble to "Jewish capitalism" as a scapegoat. (The petty bourgeoisie thus came to be used as a social base for the fight against the socialist movement.) The demagogic representation of capitalism as a "Jewish invention" was greatly facilitated by the fact that in the textile industry, the main industry of the country, a considerable proportion of the factories (in centers like Lodz and Bialystok) were owned by Jews. (At the same time the land hunger of the impoverished peasantry increased to such an extent as to make the field fertile for the expansion of the socialist movement to the villages.) The fear of socialism ~~thus also~~ pressed the landlords into joining the political movement which made antisemitism the chief plank in its platform. Finally, the clergy too regarded antisemitism as the only salvation from the dangers of atheistic socialism. In this way antisemitism appeared as the force to consolidate all the reactionary elements in the land. These elements were fused at the end of the 19th century into the National Democratic Party (N.D.).

Until the beginning of the 20th century even the reactionary N.D. party did not proceed with an openly antisemitic program. (The cause



of Polish national liberation, which had mitigated the antisemitism of 1831, 1848 and 1863, served also at this time to act as a mitigating factor. The N.D. party was clever enough not to start a struggle against the "internal enemy" at a time when the enthusiasm for throwing off the yoke of the tsarist regime was inspiring the entire population. Moreover, it did not seem possible to incite the people against the Jews at the very time when the odious tsarist government achieved world notoriety by the organization of bloody pogroms on the Jews.)

The failure of the Russian revolution of 1905 ~~also~~ meant the end of immediate prospects for Polish liberation. The N.D. party, therefore, could now turn its attention to the "internal enemy," the Jew. A violent anti-Jewish agitation was started, which reached its peak in 1912 with the organization of a boycott action against Jews throughout the land. (The pretext for the initiation of this wild campaign was the election to the Duma of a socialist deputy with the support of Jewish votes. The boycott seemed to offer a possibility whereby the oldest dreams of the Polish petty bourgeoisie of getting rid of their Jewish competitors could be realized.) "Do not buy from the Jews" became (from now on) the shopkeeper slogan of Polish shopkeeper antisemitism.

Simultaneously with the economic boycott a violent antisemitic campaign was launched in the press and in pamphlets by the leaders of the N.D. party, (such as Roman Dmowski, Theodor Jeske-Choinski, Anton Marylski and others.) The theories of the Polish antisemites were borrowed from Central Europe. They included a mixture of all kinds of antisemitic and racial "theoretical" systems. (The Jews were accused of Semitic egoism and will to power; materialism, greed and avariciousness, cruel ruthlessness, shrewdness and parasitism; self-conceit of the chosen people and hatred of gentiles, originating in the spirit of the Talmud; Jewish capitalism based on speculation, the bourse and limitless exploitation of the people; Jewish will to dominate the world; Jewish destructive spirit as the source of the subversive doctrines of atheism, liberalism, anarchism and the like. There was nothing new in the call of the Polish antisemites to all Christian peoples for economic, political and cultural self-defense against the dangerous enemies of entire Christendom.)

The original features of the antisemitic theory of the N.D. party had to be adjusted to the specific social and cultural status of the Jews in Poland. (The social status of the Jews in Poland caused a lot of trouble to the propagandists and "theoreticians" of antisemitism in that country.)

In Poland it was not as easy as in Western Europe to represent the Jewish people as a nation consisting entirely of a rich bourgeoisie class. The dire poverty of the Jewish population in the small towns and in the Jewish sections of the big cities was evident and manifest to everybody. Compelled to make the concession that there were in Poland a lot of Jews living at a very low standard, they resorted to pointing out that this very fact was a great danger for the Poles. The unparalleled poverty of the Jewish masses, they said, was evidence that the Jews were able to achieve economic superiority over the Poles by their miserly living and by their remarkable endurance under the worst conditions of life. (The "theoretical" explanation of this alleged specific characteristic of the Jews is given by the antisemites on the basis of racialism. The antisemitic Jeske Choinski thus pictures and "explains" the poverty of the Polish Jews:

For thousands of years the Jews have been living in a northern climate. Such a climate calls for more abundant and essential food than a southern climate. Yet they feed themselves in the same way as they did in Palestine. Amidst cold and frost the Jew lives a whole day on a piece of herring, on a crumb of bread watered with brandy and greased with a head of onion or garlic. A Polish dog would die with such food, yet the Jew feels fine and multiplies like the sand on the seashore.<sup>11</sup>)

Another difficulty which the N.D. antisemitic writers had to explain away was the wide prevalence of Zionism among the Polish Jews. For one of the main points in their antisemitic program was the great danger for Polish Christian culture emanating from the assimilation of the Jews. The strength of Jewish national consciousness in Poland, however, tended in the opposite direction. To this the antisemites replied that the real aim of the Jews was to establish a Jewish state in Poland with the Polish population under the domination of the Jews. The so-called assimilationist Jews, they said, were merely camouflaging the real aims of their nationalistic fellow-Jews by superficial assimilation with Polish culture, which they infected with the destructive Jewish virus. As for the Zionists, they were not a whit more sincere; they carried on their propaganda for Palestine as a Jewish national home not because they really desired to emigrate but because they wished in this way to strengthen the Jewish national spirit in Poland so as to transform that country into a Jewish national state.

(Antisemitic writers used the Jewish issue to rewrite the past history of

<sup>11</sup> Jeske Choinski, Theodor, *Pomaj żyda* (Know the Jew) (3rd ed. Warsaw 1915) p. 90.

Poland. It had been commonly accepted by Polish historians that the chief cause of the fall of the old independent state of Poland was the dominance of the corrupt and incompetent landed gentry. The N.D. party spokesmen now placed the blame for the downfall of Poland on the Jews. The Jews were responsible for the weakness of the Polish bourgeoisie. They overcame their Polish competitors by their cleverness, slyness and subterfuges. The bourgeoisie, therefore, was too weak to aid the royal power in its struggle with the nobility. And the nobility, they concluded, "would not have dared to attack the Polish city dwellers if there had been no Jews in the country."<sup>12</sup>)

## V

In the new independent Poland, restored after the World War, the forces which had brought about the strong antisemitic movement just before the World War, acted with double vehemence. (The solution of the most vital socio-economic problem of Poland for centuries, the agrarian question, made no headway after the restoration of national independence. More than half of the entire landed property was owned as previously by magnates, whereas the peasantry, amounting to 73 per cent of the population, lived on dwarfish holdings which were not sufficient even for the most modest livelihood. The economic development of the country, thwarted mainly by the pitifully low purchasing power of the peasants, encountered new difficulties created by the new political boundaries. Poland lost the pre-war Russian markets for its industrial products of textile and clothing industries and compensations in new markets were not sufficient to make up for the loss. This accounts also for the fact that Poland, in contrast to the developed capitalistic countries, could not recover after the world crisis in 1929.) The standard of living in Poland became the lowest in Europe, measured by the consumption of the main commodities and unemployed workers outnumbered the employed.

The deepening of the economic crisis in the country brought about an enormous increase in the antisemitic movement. The twin forces of antisemitism in Poland since the beginning of the 20th century, the economic competition of the small bourgeoisie and the political aim of using this movement as a diversion from revolutionary social trends, revealed themselves with a hitherto unknown violence. (The propaganda

<sup>12</sup> Marylski, A., *Dzieje sprawy żydowskiej w Polsce* (Warsaw 1912) p. 137.

of "nationalization" of Polish economy by ousting the Jews from their positions acquired a new pretext under the conditions of regained independence. Until now, it was argued, we have been occupied with the struggle for our political freedom, now that we have obtained political power, the other half of the task, the economic liberation from the Jews, has to be taken up.)

Until 1935, the year of the death of the dictator, Marshal Pilsudski, the struggle against the Jews was carried out by the old antisemitic N.D. party. The ruling semi-fascist camp of the *Sanacja* had not hitherto manifested openly its antisemitism. It was restrained by the traditions of the camp which had fought for the freedom of Poland. Secondly, in contrast to the N.D., the ruling camp followed a more prudent course in carrying out its antisemitic program, restricting the Jews more and more in their economic activities in order to strengthen the "Polish element" in the country. The death of Marshal Pilsudski, coinciding with a phase of a sharpened economic crisis, induced the government to resort more and more to an undisguised antisemitic policy. Incapable of finding a remedy for the crisis and unwilling to touch the property of the landed aristocracy, the regime also came to look upon antisemitism as a way of deflecting the embittered population from the essential social issue. In addition, with the death of Pilsudski the government lost the great prestige of the authority he had enjoyed as a national hero and in order to win over the adherents of the rival N.D. party it had to match its whole antisemitic program. Since the agrarian question constituted the chief sore spot in the country the Jewish question was artificially linked with the problem of the poverty of the peasants. In the new antisemitic propaganda of the *Sanacja* the peasants were told that a solution for their economic plight could be found in their replacing the Jewish hawkers in the towns. The "nationalization" of commerce was adopted by the government as its own program.<sup>13</sup> The Camp of National Unification (OZON), organized in 1936 under the auspices of the government, proclaimed the necessity of ousting the Jews from the positions held by them in the economy as well as in the culture of the country. The necessity for the emigration of a great part of Polish Jewry was expressed officially by Polish ministers on many occasions.)

<sup>13</sup> The conference of the Polish merchants in Warsaw in 1937, which adopted resolutions to oust the Jews from commerce, was greeted personally by the president of the republic, Moscicki.

(The non-productive activities of a great number of the Jews in Poland and the resulting extreme poverty were offered as proof that they were superfluous elements in the country. As a matter of fact a large number of Jews, despite immense obstacles placed in their way, had become engaged in more productive economic activities in independent Poland. According to the census of 1931 there were 42 percent of the Jews engaged in industry as compared with 37 percent engaged in commerce. And yet the same government which had ousted Jewish workers from factories, which it had taken over as a monopoly (tobacco, brandy, matches), was irresponsible enough to sound an alarm over the unproductivity of the Jewish masses.)

New extreme fascist organizations also came into being, with the connivance of the government, which demanded the extreme radical "solution" of the Jewish question. The Jews, they said, should be expelled from Poland entirely, and their property confiscated without indemnity. (The social and political link between the agrarian problem and the antisemitic movement is revealed most clearly in the programs of these extreme fascist groups. One of the representatives of this trend, Mosdorf, proposed the following solution of the agrarian problem: the big landowners whose holdings would be distributed to peasants were to be indemnified from the confiscated estates of the Jews expelled from the cities. The antisemitic ideology of this fascist wing was a mixture of all the prevailing antisemitic doctrines, including some borrowings from the Nazi movement. The racial factor was not stressed as much as among the Nazis in view of the fact that the number of Jews converted to Christianity was comparatively less in Poland than in Germany. On the other hand Catholicism and the Christian ideals of the Middle Ages were used as spiritual foundations for their antisemitism. Like the old N.D. party) these new groups reinterpreted the history of Poland in the light of their antisemitic principles. (Whereas the old N.D. party had discovered that the Jews were the cause of the economic and social-political backwardness of the country, the new offspring of this party found out) that Poland had been dominated by Jews since the 16th century through the mediation of the Freemasons, who were the expounders of Jewish political aims. The Jews and their henchmen, the Freemasons, were responsible for the partitions of Poland as well as for all the insurrections: the insurrection of Kosciuszko in 1794, the November insurrection in 1830, the January insurrection in 1863 and the armed struggle of the Polish

Socialist Party against tsarist Russia. They argued that the Jews and Freemasons had an interest in inciting the Polish people to fruitless bloodshed in order to weaken the country which they then find easier to dominate.) In practice the program of the fascists manifested itself not only in picketing Jewish shops and stores, expelling Jewish students from the university and college lecture halls, but also in organizing a series of bloody pogroms, which did not cease until the outbreak of the second World War.

Fortunately for both the Polish and Jewish people the hideous anti-semitic propaganda did not find strong support among the masses of the population. Polish workers often displayed such a genuine awareness of their real enemies that they frequently drove away the boycott pickets from the Jewish stores. (The Polish peasants, although less enlightened than the workers, realized that the antisemitic propaganda was aimed at them no less than at the Jews. The bloody riots of the embittered peasants in Galicia, which broke out in August, 1937, were directed against the semi-fascist government and no Jew was assaulted at that time. "We don't want to take over the Jewish stalls in the town, we want to stay in the villages and get land." This was almost literally the slogan given by them as an answer to the antisemitic promises of the political camp then in power.)

## VI

Scarcely two percent of Polish Jewry remained to witness the liberation; (some 200,000 had found refuge in the Soviet Union and 50,000 others survived in concentration camps in Germany.<sup>14</sup>) The extermination of the Jews of Poland reached a degree unparalleled not only in other European countries but in the history of mankind. This cruel fate, coupled with the no less horrible fact that the worst of the Nazi extermination centers (Maidanek, Treblinka, Oswiecim, etc.) were established in Poland, has tended to confirm the belief regarding the exceptional intensity and pervasiveness of Polish antisemitism. (This notion is, however, by no means justified. In point of fact the Jews in territories adjacent to the present eastern frontier of Poland (inhabited largely by non-Polish populations) suffered no less than those in predominantly Polish regions. This refers to eastern Galicia, Volhynia, western White Russia

<sup>14</sup> No figures are available as to the number from the territories annexed by the USSR who survived as refugees in the interior of the Soviet Union.

and the Baltic countries. Apart from those saved by evacuation and by joining the Soviet army, the ratio of survivors in the Soviet Ukraine and White Russia (pre-1939 boundaries) is no greater than in Poland)

(As far as active collaboration with the Nazis in carrying out the mass murder of the Jews is concerned, the record of the Ukrainians (particularly in eastern Galicia), Lithuanians and Latvians is even more blood-stained than that of the Poles. There is no doubt that in Poland the Nazi authorities harvested the crop sown by the *Endeks* and *Sanacja* and that they capitalized on the economic antagonism between the Polish petty bourgeoisie and the Jews.) The unique tragedy of Polish Jewry appears, ~~nevertheless~~ as but a part of the great catastrophe of East-European Jewry as a whole.

(Inasmuch as this sore problem requires thorough elucidation, one cannot escape a consideration of the main factors underlying these gruesome events. The Nazi terror was in general far more severe in Eastern than in Western Europe. The Nazis' program of depopulation was carried out in Eastern Europe in the most brutal way. As for the Jews in particular, we should bear in mind that the external differences between Jews and non-Jews have been much more marked in the Slavic countries than in Western Europe. This visibility of the Jews in Eastern Europe would in itself have sufficed to defeat their attempts to escape annihilation by disguising themselves. The attitude of the general population of the Nazi-occupied countries was, nevertheless, even more fatal.) In Eastern Europe, it was above all the retarded historical development, characterized by the absence of any deep-rooted traditions of tolerance and liberalism, which proved most disastrous for the Jews. The backward peasants and townfolk in Poland, as well as in neighboring countries, were much less ready to risk their lives for the rescue of Jews, still viewed as "infidels," than the more enlightened population of Western Europe.

(Neither in regard to Poland nor any of the neighboring countries can condemnation for the passive attitude in the face of the atrocities committed be heaped on the entire non-Jewish population indiscriminately.) The few score thousand Jews who survived in Poland owe their lives to Poles who gave them shelter, food and protection at the risk of their own lives. As has justly been pointed out by several spokesmen of the Provisional Polish Government, for every Jew who survived many Poles had to be involved in a conspiracy punishable by death. (It is no less relevant to record that) the labor movement, the only progressive social force in

Poland and other backward countries, stood the test during the Nazi occupation. It cooperated closely with the underground movement in the Warsaw ghetto, and when the heroic uprising of the Jews began, supplied the weapons; it helped the Jewish partisans and assisted in every way the Jews hidden in the "Aryan" sections of Warsaw. Unfortunately, such was the backwardness of Poland that the labor movement was too weak numerically to mobilize the majority of the population in behalf of the doomed Jews.)

## VII

Unlike the "democracy" established in Poland after the first World War, the democracy of liberated Poland has this time been built on the solid foundations of socio-economic reconstruction. (The main root of the country's retardation, the unsolved agrarian problem, has been cut once and for all. All private estates larger than 50 hectares (about 123 acres) have been parcelled out to landless and small peasants. While this decisive reform is bound to bear fruit in the expansion of the domestic market, the importance of the liquidation of the landed gentry class is equally great. As a counterpart to this agrarian reform, all industrial enterprises employing over 50 workers have been nationalized. The agrarian and industrial reforms, together with the incorporation into the Polish state of highly industrialized, former German territories, including a long coast line on the Baltic Sea, have laid the foundations for the development of Poland as a modern, industrialized nation. These achievements have been made possible by, and will depend for their consolidation on, a democratic government in which the workers and the peasants have the decisive role.

(In its manifesto, issued the day after its formation, July 22, 1944, the Polish Committee of National Liberation not only pledged "democratic freedom and equality to all citizens, regardless of race, creed, and national origin," but added specifically that "Jews, whom the invaders have spared from brutal extermination, will be assured normal conditions of existence, as well as full legal and actual equality." The provisional government of Poland, formed on December 31 of that year and reorganized on June 28, 1945 as the Provisional Government of National Unity, has earnestly endeavored to fulfill its pledge to the Jews.

The Central Jewish Committee, the official organization of the Jews in Poland, has received assistance from the Ministry of Social Welfare to



an extent far exceeding the ratio of Jews to the total population, in recognition of the fact that the Jews constitute the most destitute group. All educational and cultural institutions of the reviving Jewish community receive state subsidies, and conduct their activities in Yiddish, and to some extent Hebrew. For the first time in the history of Poland, moreover, Jews have received full opportunities of entering government-owned enterprises and the civil service, including the highest posts; at the present time one minister and several vice ministers are Jews. (In general,) the attitude of the government toward the Jews has been permeated by a spirit of sincerity and helpfulness.

Despite this official policy, antisemitism is still rife in Poland to an extent unknown in its history. (All reports agree that among wide sections of the population, particularly among the lower middle class and the intelligentsia, the hostility has increased greatly in comparison with the prewar era. A direct menace to the lives of the Jews is the wave of murderous assaults which has swept the country since the liberation.) It is estimated that no less than 1,000 Jews, many of whom had survived the horrors of concentration camps, have been killed during the past two years.

This new tragedy of the survivors is an obvious result of the unconsolidated political situation. There have been relatively few instances (as in Cracow in 1945, and Kielce, 1946) of pogroms, in the strict sense of the word, committed by incited mobs. As a rule, the Jews have fallen victim to sudden attacks of the armed bands of the fascist *Narodowe Sily Zbrojne* (National Armed Forces). These bands have also been guilty of the murder of many thousands of non-Jews, including Polish and Soviet soldiers, government officials and leaders of political parties, particularly socialists and communists. Thus, once again, as has repeatedly happened in modern history, anti-Jewish attacks are being used as a stratagem of diversion by the enemies of progress. These murders are blows directed against the government, because it has adopted a progressive program. The government has responded with energetic measures. On December 17, 1945 a decree adopted by the National Council was promulgated, providing the penalty under martial law of death or life imprisonment for acts of violence against persons of another nationality or religion as well as for participation in the activities of mobs conducting attacks against such persons. Thus far, this measure has not been effective in deterring the antisemitic bands from committing

murder. There is, however, every hope that with the consolidation of the political situation, the smoldering remnants of fascism will be thoroughly liquidated.)

The disappearance of antisemitism, which still permeates large strata of Polish society, will, ~~however~~, be a slower process. As in many other European countries, which underwent Nazi occupation, ~~particularly in neighboring Slovakia~~, the animosity of the petty bourgeoisie against the Jews in Poland, in addition to the results of continuous, systematic Nazi propaganda, is stimulated by purely economic motives. Those Poles, who under Nazi rule had taken possession of Jewish houses and movable property, look upon every Jew as the potential expropriator of their spoil. (Among large groups of the Polish intelligentsia the resentment against the Jews is of an even more complicated nature. It reflects their dissatisfaction with the position of equality of Jews who have entered public service, a field which had never before been accessible to them to any extent. This chauvinist intelligentsia has selected the Jews as a convenient scapegoat to bear the blame for radical social reforms as well as for the loss of former Polish provinces to the "Bolsheviks.")

An energetic educational campaign against antisemitism has recently been started by the League against Racial Discrimination, organized on April 2, 1946 with the participation of the six political parties represented in the government. Though the importance and effect of a systematic educational program in the spirit of tolerance is not to be underestimated, the main hope for the elimination of the antisemitic plague rests on the success of the country's reconstruction on a new socio-economic and political system. In the meantime the overwhelming majority of the Jews would prefer to emigrate at the first opportunity rather than to wait for the fruits of the new era. (Thus, the realization of the desire of the "Anonymous" Polish pamphlet of 1782, "that the dissension between two nations on one soil may be buried forever," may take place at a time when a tiny remnant of the once largest Jewish community in Europe will remain on Polish soil.)

## FROM THE DREYFUS AFFAIR TO FRANCE TODAY

By HANNAH ARENDT

### *The Facts of the Case*

It happened in France at the end of the year 1894. Alfred Dreyfus, a Jewish officer of the French General Staff, was accused and convicted of espionage for Germany. The verdict, lifelong deportation to Devil's Island, was unanimously adopted. The trial took place behind closed doors. Out of an allegedly voluminous dossier of the prosecution, only the so-called "bordereau" was published. This was a letter, supposedly in Dreyfus' handwriting, addressed to the German military attaché, Schwartzkoppen. In July 1895 Colonel Picquard became head of the Information Division of the General Staff. In May 1896 he told the chief of the General Staff, Boisdeffre, that he had convinced himself of Dreyfus' innocence and of the guilt of another officer, Major Walsin-Esterhazy. Six months later, Picquard was removed to a dangerous post in Tunisia. At the same time, Bernard Lazare, on behalf of Dreyfus' brothers, published the first pamphlet of the Affair: *Une erreur judiciaire; la vérité sur l'affaire Dreyfus*. In June 1897 Picquard informed Scheurer-Kesten, Vice-President of the Senate, of the facts of the trials and of Dreyfus' innocence. In November 1897 Clémenceau started his fight for re-examination of the case. Four weeks later Zola joined the ranks of the "Dreyfusards." *J'Accuse* was published by Clémenceau's newspaper in January 1898. At the same time, Picquard was arrested. Zola, tried for calumny of the army, was convicted by both the ordinary tribunal and the Court of Appeal. In August 1898 Esterhazy was dishonorably discharged because of embezzlement. He at once hurried to a British journalist and told him that he—and not Dreyfus—was the author of the "bordereau," which he had forged in Dreyfus' handwriting on orders from Colonel Sandherr, his superior and former chief of the counter espionage division. A few days later Colonel Henry, another member of the same department, confessed forgeries of several other pieces of the secret Dreyfus-dossier and committed suicide. Thereupon the Court of Appeal ordered an investigation of the Dreyfus case.

In June 1899 the Court of Appeal annulled the original sentence

against Dreyfus of 1894. The revision-trial took place in Rennes in August. The sentence was made ten years' imprisonment because of "alleviating circumstances." A week later Dreyfus was pardoned by the President of the Republic. The World Exposition opened in Paris in April 1900. In May, when the success of the Exposition was guaranteed, the Chamber of Deputies, with overwhelming majority, voted against any further revision of the Dreyfus case. In December of the same year all trials and lawsuits connected with the affair were liquidated through a general amnesty.

In 1903 Dreyfus asked for a new revision. His petition was neglected until 1906, when Clémenceau had become Prime Minister. In July 1906 the Court of Appeal annulled the sentence of Rennes and acquitted Dreyfus of all charges. The Court of Appeal, however, had no authority to acquit; it should have ordered a new trial. Another revision before a military tribunal would, in all probability and despite the overwhelming evidence in favor of Dreyfus, have led to a new conviction. Dreyfus, therefore, never was acquitted in accordance with the law.<sup>1</sup>

"What irony is this," cried Georges Clémenceau, "that men should have stormed the Bastille, guillotined their king and promoted a major revolution, only to discover in the end that it had become impossible to get a man tried in accordance with the law!"<sup>2</sup> Indeed, it must have been a bitter experience for the French people to watch the century which had opened with the Revolution and the fame of the *Grande Armée* come to an end in a morass of petty scandals and political graft, with republic and army alike in the dust and a hitherto unknown species of nationalism, cruel, cynical and full of humbug, rearing its ugly head.<sup>3</sup> More dreadful still, however, was the experience of the Jewish people who saw their liberty challenged and their rights impugned in the very land which had been the cradle of their emancipation.

The case of Captain Dreyfus was never really settled. The reinstate-

<sup>1</sup> The most extensive and still indispensable work on the subject is that of Reinach, Joseph, *L'Affaire Dreyfus* (Paris 1908-11) 7 vols. The most detailed among recent studies, written from a socialist viewpoint, is by Herzog, Wilhelm, *Der Kampf einer Republik* (Zürich 1935). Very valuable are its exhaustive chronological tables. The best political and historical evaluation of the affair is to be found in Brogan, D. W., *The Development of Modern France* (1940) bks. vi and vii. Brief and reliable is Charensol, G., *L'Affaire Dreyfus et la Troisième République* (1930).

<sup>2</sup> Clémenceau, *Contre la justice* (Paris 1900); article dated February 5, 1899.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. du Gard, Roger Martin, *Jean Barois* (Paris 1925) p. 313: "This is a remarkable century which opened with the Revolution and ended with the *Affaire*! Perhaps it will be called the century of rubbish."

ment of the accused was never recognized by the masses and the passions which were originally aroused never entirely subsided. As late as 1908, nine years after the pardon and two years after Dreyfus was cleared, when, at Clémenceau's instance, the body of Emile Zola was transferred to the Pantheon, Alfred Dreyfus was openly attacked on the street. A Paris court, moreover, by acquitting his assailant indicated that it "dissented" from the decision which had cleared Dreyfus. Even more significant is the strange fact that neither the first nor the second World War has been able to bury the affair in oblivion.<sup>4</sup> At the première of "L'Affaire Dreyfus" in 1931,<sup>5</sup> the atmosphere of the nineties still prevailed with quarrels in the auditorium, stinkbombs in the stalls, the shock troops of the Action Française standing around to strike terror in actors, audience and bystanders. Nor did the government—Laval's government—act in any way other than its predecessors some thirty years ago: it gladly admitted to be unable (actually it was unwilling) to guarantee a single undisturbed performance, thereby providing a new late triumph for the anti-Dreyfusards. The play had to be suspended. When Dreyfus died in 1935, the general press was afraid to touch the issue<sup>6</sup> while the leftist papers still spoke in the old terms of Dreyfus' innocence and the right-wing of Dreyfus' guilt.

Even today the Dreyfus affair is still a kind of shibboleth in French politics. When Pétain was condemned the influential provincial newspaper *Voix du Nord* (of Lille) linked the Pétain case to the Dreyfus case and maintained that "the country remains divided as it was after the Dreyfus case," because the verdict of the court could not settle a political conflict and "bring to all the French peace of mind or of heart."<sup>7</sup> This means that French tribunals still lack sufficient authority to apply the law—a state of affairs in which Clémenceau fifty years earlier recognized the approaching end of constitutional government and the coming decay of the national state.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>4</sup> During the 'twenties two officers at the behest of the *Action Française* undertook to establish Dreyfus' guilt. The result is embodied in the standard reference manual of the anti-Dreyfusards, Dutrait-Crozon, Henri (a pseudonym). *Précis de l'Affaire Dreyfus* (Paris 1924).

<sup>5</sup> Written by Rehfish and Wilhelm Herzog this drama appeared under the pseudonym of René Kestner.

<sup>6</sup> The *Action Française* (July 19, 1935) praised the restraint of the French press while voicing the opinion that "the famous champions of justice and truth of forty years ago have left no disciples."

<sup>7</sup> See G. H. Archambault in *New York Times* (August 18, 1945) p. 5.

<sup>8</sup> See his article dated January 17, 1898 in *L'Iniquité* (Paris 1899): "Patriotism requires a fatherland. And there can be no fatherland without justice. There is no fatherland without law."

*From the Farce to the Catastrophe*

While the Dreyfus affair in its broader political aspects belongs to the twentieth century, the Dreyfus case, the various trials of the Jewish Captain Alfred Dreyfus are quite typical of the nineteenth century, when men followed legal proceedings so keenly because each instance afforded a test of its greatest achievement, the complete impartiality of the law. It is characteristic of the period that a miscarriage of justice could arouse such political passions and inspire such an endless succession of trials and retrials, not to speak of duels and fisticuffs. The doctrine of equality before the law was still so firmly implanted in the conscience of the civilized world that a single miscarriage of justice could provoke public indignation from Moscow to New York. Nor was any one, except in France itself, so advanced in modernism as to associate the matter with political issues.<sup>9</sup> The wrong done to a single Jewish officer in France was able to draw from the rest of the world a more vehement and united reaction than all the persecutions of German Jews a generation later. Even Tsarist Russia could accuse France of barbarism while in Germany members of the Kaiser's entourage would express themselves openly in terms of indignation matched only by the radical press of the nineteenth-thirties.<sup>10</sup>

The *dramatis personae* of the case might have stepped out of the pages of Balzac: on the one hand, the class-conscious generals frantically covering up for the members of their own clique and, on the other, their antagonist, Picquard, with his calm, clear-eyed and slightly ironical honesty. Beside them stand the nondescript crowd of the men in Parliament, each terrified of what his neighbor might know; the president of the republic, notorious patron of the Paris brothels, and the examining magistrates, living solely for the sake of social contacts. Then there is Dreyfus him-

<sup>9</sup> The sole exceptions, the Catholic journals most of which agitated in all countries against Dreyfus, will be discussed below. American public opinion was such that in addition to protests there began to be organized a boycott of the Paris World Exposition scheduled for 1900. On the effect of this threat see below. For a comprehensive study of this subject see the master's essay on file at Columbia University by Rose A. Halperin, "The American Reaction to the Dreyfus Case" (1941). The author wishes to thank Professor S. W. Baron for his kindness in placing this study at her disposal.

<sup>10</sup> Thus, for example, H. B. von Buelow, the German chargé d'affaires at Paris, wrote to Reich Chancellor Hohenlohe regarding the verdict at Rennes that it was a "mixture of vulgarity and cowardice, the surest signs of barbarism," and that France "has therewith shut herself out of the family of civilized nations," cited by Herzog, *op. cit.*, under date of September 12, 1899. In the opinion of von Buelow the *Affaire* was the "shibboleth" of German liberalism; see his *Denkwürdigkeiten* (Berlin 1900-51) vol. I, p. 423.

self, actually a parvenu, continually boasting to his colleagues of his family fortune which he spent on women; his brothers, pathetically offering their entire fortune and then reducing the offer to 150,000 francs for the release of their kinsman, never quite sure whether they wished to make a sacrifice or simply to suborn the general staff; and the lawyer Démange, really convinced of his client's innocence but basing the defense on an issue of doubt so as to save himself from attacks and injury to his personal interests. Lastly, there is the adventurer Esterhazy, he of the ancient escutcheon, so utterly bored by this bourgeois world as to seek relief equally in heroism and knavery. An erstwhile second lieutenant of the Foreign Legion, he greatly impressed his colleagues by his superior boldness and impudence. Always in trouble, he lived by serving as duelist's second to Jewish officers and by blackmailing their wealthy co-religionists. Indeed, he would avail himself of the good offices of the chief rabbi himself in order to obtain the requisite introductions. Even in his ultimate downfall he remained true to the Balzac tradition. Not treason nor wild dreams of a great orgy in which a hundred thousand besotten Prussian Uhlans would run berserk through Paris<sup>11</sup> but a paltry embezzlement of a relative's cash sent him to his doom. And what shall we say of Zola, with his impassioned moral fervor, his somewhat empty pathos and his melodramatic declaration, on the eve of his flight to London, that he had heard the voice of Dreyfus begging him to bring this sacrifice?<sup>12</sup>

All this belongs typically to the nineteenth century and by itself would never have survived two World Wars. The old-time enthusiasm of the mob for Esterhazy, like its hatred against Zola, have long since died down to embers, but so too has that fiery passion against aristocracy and clergy which had once inflamed Jaurès and which had alone secured the final release of Dreyfus. As the Cagouard affair was to show, officers of the general staff had no longer to fear the wrath of the people when they hatched their plots for a coup d'état. Since the separation of church and state, France, though certainly no longer clerically-minded, had lost a great deal of her anti-clerical feeling, just as the Catholic Church had itself lost a great part of its political aspirations. Pétain's recent attempt to convert the republic into a Catholic state was blocked by the utter indifference of the people and by the lower clergy's hostility to clerico-fascism.

<sup>11</sup> Reinach, Théodore, *Histoire sommaire de l'Affaire Dreyfus* (Paris 1924) p. 96.

<sup>12</sup> Reported by Joseph Reinach, as cited by Herzog, *op. cit.*, under date of June 18, 1898.

Nevertheless, the Dreyfus case left behind it two significant legacies. The first is hatred of the Jews; the second, suspicion of the republic itself, of Parliament and the state machine. The larger section of the public could still go on considering them, rightly or wrongly, as under the influence of the Jews and the power of the banks. Down to our times the term anti-Dreyfusard can still serve as a recognized appellation of all that is anti-republican, anti-democratic and antisemitic. A few years ago it still comprised everything, from the monarchism of the Action Française to the National Bolshevism of Doriot and the social fascism of Déat. It was not, however, to these fascist groups, numerically unimportant as they were, that the Third Republic owed its collapse. On the contrary, the plain, if paradoxical, truth is that their influence was never so slight as at the moment when the collapse actually took place. What made France fall was the fact that she had no more true Dreyfusards, no one who believed that democracy and freedom, equality and justice could any longer be defended or realized under the republic.<sup>13</sup> At long last the republic fell like overripe fruit into the lap of that old anti-Dreyfusard clique<sup>14</sup> who had always formed the kernel of her army, and this at a time when she had few enemies but almost no friends. How little the Pétain clique was a product of German fascism was shown clearly by its slavish adherence to the old formulas of forty years ago. That notorious Anglophobia, which once set the entire colonial administration against the republic and which was really the result of reverses in Egypt, remained unaltered, despite the fact that the French possessions in North Africa were threatened from quite a different quarter.

While Germany shrewdly truncated her and ruined her entire econ-

<sup>13</sup> That even Clémenceau no longer believed in it toward the end of his life is shown clearly by the remark quoted in Benjamin, René, *Clémenceau dans la retraite* (Paris 1980) p. 249: "Hope? Impossible! How can I go on hoping when I no longer believe in that which roused me, namely, democracy?"

<sup>14</sup> Weygand, a known adherent of the Action Française, was in his youth an anti-Dreyfusard. He was one of the subscribers to the "Henry Memorial" established by the *Libre Parole* in honor of the unfortunate Colonel Henry, who paid with suicide for his forgeries while on the General Staff. The list of subscribers was later published by Guillard, one of the editors of *L'Aurore* (Clémenceau's paper), under the title of *Le Monument Henry* (Paris 1899). As for Pétain, he was on the general staff of the military government of Paris from 1895 to 1899, at a time when nobody but a proven anti-Dreyfusard would have been tolerated. See de Latour, Contamine, "Le Maréchal Pétain," in *Revue de Paris*, vol. 1, p. 57-69. Brogan, D. W., *The Development of Modern France*, p. 382, pertinently observes that of the five World War I marshals, four (Foch, Pétain, Lyautey and Fayolle) were bad republicans, while the fifth, Joffre, had well-known clerical leanings.



omy through the demarcation-line, France's leaders in Vichy tinkered with the old Barrès formula of "autonomous provinces," thereby crippling her all the more. They introduced anti-Jewish legislation more promptly than any Quisling, boasting all the while that they had no need to import antisemitism from Germany and that their law governing the Jews differed in essential points from that of the Reich.<sup>15</sup> They sought to mobilize the Catholic clergy against the Jews, only to give proof that the priests have not only lost their political influence but are not actually antisemites. On the contrary, it is the very bishops and synods which the Vichy regime would turn once more into political powers who voiced the most emphatic protest against the persecution of the Jews.

Not the mere trials but the Dreyfus affair in its entirety offers a foregleam of the twentieth century. As Bernanos pointed out in 1931,<sup>16</sup> "The Dreyfus affair already belongs to that tragic era which certainly was not ended by the last war. The affair reveals the same inhuman character, preserving amid the welter of unbridled passions and the flames of hate an inconceivably cold and callous heart." It was not in France, however, that the true sequel to the affair was to be found. The Third Republic succumbed to the deep-rooted evils of the nineteenth century which won political significance first in France, while their tremendous power of destruction first broke out in Germany.

The reason that France fell an easy prey to Nazi aggression is not far to seek. Hitler's propaganda spoke in a language long familiar and never

<sup>15</sup> The myth that Pétain's anti-Jewish legislation was forced upon him by the Reich, which took in almost the whole of French Jewry, has been exploded on the French side itself. See especially the excellent work of Simon, Yves, *La Grande crise de la République Française: observations sur la vie politique des français de 1918 à 1938* (Montreal 1941). It is partly on Simon's conclusions (p. 175 ff.) that our estimate of France's post-war situation is based. That French antisemitism did not have to be invented by Pétain is shown further by Giraudoux, J., *Pleins Pouvoirs* (Paris 1939). The author was a close friend of Daladier and was minister of propaganda in the Daladier cabinet until its collapse. His antisemitic diatribes (p. 66 ff.) are directed specifically against the poorer Jews born abroad and it is just this tendency which characterized the Vichy laws. Two years before the Pétain regime Giraudoux was writing: "We agree entirely with Hitler that no policy can attain its higher form unless it be racial;" *op. cit.*, 75-76. Giraudoux is still highly estimated by French intellectuals and, as far as I know, none of the new papers and magazines in liberated France has denounced his antisemitism and pro-fascist attitude before and during the war.

For Nazi criticism of French antisemitism see Vernunft, Wilfried, "Die Hintergründe des französischen Antisemitismus," in *Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte* (June, 1939); this critic spares Céline alone.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Bernanos, Georges, *La Grande peur des bien-pensants, Edouard Drumont* (Paris 1931) p. 262.

quite forgotten. That the "Caesarism"<sup>17</sup> of the Action Française and the nihilistic nationalism of Barrès and Maurras never succeeded in their original form is due to a variety of causes, all of them negative. They lacked social vision and were unable to translate into popular terms those mental phantasmagoria which their contempt for the intellect had engendered. Moreover, France was saved from the taint of an indigenous fascism by that revolutionary tradition which saw in the ideal of equality a prime source of her glory and of which Clémenceau was the last champion. However, while this patriotism of the last Jacobin still won the first World War it was incapable of winning the peace.<sup>18</sup>

The present study is concerned essentially with the political bearings of the Dreyfus affair and not with the legal aspects of the case. Sharply outlined in it are a number of traits characteristic of the twentieth century. Faint and barely distinguishable during the early decades of the century, they have at last emerged into full daylight and stand revealed to us as belonging to the main trends of modern times. After thirty years of a mild, purely social form of antisemitism it had become a little difficult to remember that the cry, "Death to the Jews," had echoed through the length and breadth of a modern state once before when its domestic policy was crystallized in the issue of antisemitism. Forgotten were the Algerian pogroms instigated and carried out not, as was claimed, by "backward Arabs" but by thoroughly sophisticated officers of the French colonial administration. And forgotten too were the days when a free and equal franchise elected the Jew-hater, Karl Lueger, mayor of Vienna and another, Max Régis, mayor of Algiers. For thirty years the old legends of world conspiracy had been no more than the conventional stand-by of the tabloid press and the dime novel and the world did not easily remember that not long ago, but at a time when the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* were still unknown, a whole nation had been wracking its brains trying to determine whether "secret Rome" or "secret Judah" held the reins of world politics.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Gurian, Waldemar, *Der integrale Nationalismus in Frankreich: Charles Maurras und die Action Française* (Frankfurt-am-Main 1931) p. 92, makes a sharp distinction between the monarchist movement and other reactionary tendencies. The same author discusses the Dreyfus case in his *Die politischen und sozialen Ideen des französischen Katholizismus* (M. Gladbach 1929).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Simon, *op. cit.*, p. 20: "The spirit of the French Revolution survived the defeat of Napoleon for more than a century. . . . It triumphed but only to fade unnoticed on November 11, 1918. The French Revolution? Its dates must surely be set at 1789-1918."

<sup>19</sup> For the creation of such myths on both sides, cf. Halévy, Daniel, "Apologie pour notre

The vehement and nihilistic philosophy of spiritual self-hatred<sup>20</sup> suffered something of an eclipse when a world at temporary peace with itself yielded no crop of outstanding criminals to justify the exaltation of brutality and unscrupulousness. The Jules Guérins had to wait nearly forty years before the atmosphere was ripe again for quasi-military storm-troops. The *declassés*, produced through 19th-century economy, had to grow numerically until they were strong minorities of the nations, before that coup d'état, which had remained but a grotesque plot<sup>21</sup> in France, could achieve reality in Germany almost without effort. The prelude to Nazism was played over the entire European stage. German political romanticism was an integral part of it and so was Pan-Slavism, in which the doctrine of racial selection was first combined with anti-semitism. It is into this general framework that the history of the Dreyfus case, like that of "Christian Social" antisemitism in Austria, fits. For the present purpose, therefore, the Dreyfus case is no bizarre, imperfectly solved "crime,"<sup>22</sup> not an affair of staff officers disguised by false beards and dark glasses, peddling their sinister forgeries by night in the streets of Paris. Its hero is not Dreyfus but Clémenceau and it begins not with the arrest of a Jewish staff officer but with the Panama scandal.

### *The Third Republic and French Jewry*

Between 1880 and 1888 the Panama Company, under the leadership of de Lesseps, who had constructed the Suez Canal, was able to make but little practical progress. Nevertheless, within France itself it succeeded during this period in raising no less than 1,335,538,454 francs in private loans.<sup>23</sup> This success is the more significant when one considers the *care-passe*, in *Cahiers de la quinzaine*, series 11, no. 10 (1910); even Herzog, *op. cit.*, p. 27 ff., retained a belief in "secret Rome."

<sup>20</sup> A distinctly modern note is struck in Zola's *Letter to France* of 1898: "We hear on all sides that the concept of liberty has gone bankrupt. When the Dreyfus business cropped up, this prevalent hatred of liberty found a golden opportunity. . . . Don't you see that the only reason why Scheurer-Kestner has been attacked with such fury is that he belongs to a generation which believed in liberty and worked for it? Today one shrugs one's shoulders at such things . . . 'Old greybeards,' one laughs, 'outmoded greathearts.'" Cf. Herzog, *op. cit.*, under date of January 6, 1898.

<sup>21</sup> The farcicality of the various attempts made during the 'nineties to stage a coup d'état was clearly analyzed by Rosa Luxemburg in her article, "Die soziale Krise in Frankreich," in *Die Neue Zeit*, vol. 1 (1901).

<sup>22</sup> Whether Colonel Henry forged the *bordersau* on orders from the chief of staff or upon his own initiative, is still unknown. Similarly, the attempted assassination of Labori, counsel for Dreyfus at the Rennes tribunal, has never been properly cleared up. Cf. Zola, *Emile, Correspondence: lettres à Maître Labori* (Paris 1929) p. 82, n. 1.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Frank, Walter, *Demokratie und Nationalismus in Frankreich* (Hamburg 1933) p. 273.

fulness of the French middle class in money matters. The secret of the company's success lies in the fact that its several public loans were invariably backed by Parliament. The building of the Canal was generally regarded as a public and national service rather than as a private enterprise. When the company went bankrupt, therefore, it was the foreign policy of the republic that really suffered the blow. Only after a few years did it become clear that even more important was the ruination of some half million middle-class Frenchmen. Both the press and the Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry came to roughly the same conclusion: the company had already been bankrupt for several years. De Lesseps, they contended, had been living in hopes of a miracle, cherishing the dream that new funds would be somehow forthcoming to push on with the work. In order to win sanction for the new loans he had been obliged to bribe the press, half of Parliament and all of the higher officials. This, however, had called for the employment of middlemen and these in turn had commanded exorbitant commissions. Thus, the very thing which had originally inspired public confidence in the enterprise, namely, Parliament's backing of the loans, proved in the end the factor which converted a more or less sound private business into a colossal racket.

There were no Jews either among the bribed members of Parliament or on the board of the company. Jacques Reinach and Cornélius Herz, however, vied for the honor of distributing the baksheesh among the members of the Chamber, the former working on the right wing of the bourgeois parties and the latter on the radicals (the anti-clerical parties of the petty bourgeoisie).<sup>24</sup> Reinach was the secret financial counsellor of the government during the 'eighties<sup>25</sup> and therefore handled its relations with the Panama Company, while Herz's role was a double one. On the one hand he served Reinach as liaison with the radical wings of Parliament, to which Reinach himself had no access; on the other this office gave him such a good insight into the extent of the corruption that he was able constantly to blackmail his boss and to involve him ever deeper in the mess.<sup>26</sup>

Naturally there were quite a number of smaller Jewish businessmen working for both Herz and Reinach. Their names, however, may well

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Suarez, Georges, *La Vie orgueilleuse de Clémenceau* (Paris 1930) p. 156.

<sup>25</sup> Such, for instance, was the testimony of the former minister, Rouvier, before the Commission of Inquiry.

<sup>26</sup> Barrès (quoted by Bernanos, *op. cit.*, p. 271) puts the matter tersely: "Whenever Reinach had swallowed something, it was Cornélius Herz who knew how to make him disgorge it."

continue to repose in the oblivion into which they have deservedly fallen. The more uncertain the situation of the company, the higher, naturally, was the rate of commission, until in the end the company itself received but little of the moneys advanced to it. Shortly before the crash Herz received for a single intra-parliamentary transaction an advance of no less than 600,000 francs. The advance, however, was premature. The loan was not taken up and the shareholders were simply 600,000 francs out of pocket.<sup>27</sup> The whole ugly racket ended disastrously for Reinach. Harassed by the blackmail of Herz he finally committed suicide.<sup>28</sup>

Shortly before his death, however, he had taken a step the consequences of which for French Jewry can scarcely be exaggerated. He had given the *Libre Parole*, Edouard Drumont's antisemitic daily, his list of suborned members of Parliament, the so-called "remittance men," imposing as the sole condition that the paper should cover up for him personally when it published its exposure. The *Libre Parole* was transformed overnight from a small and politically insignificant sheet into one of the most influential papers in the country with 300,000 circulation. The golden opportunity proffered by Reinach was handled with consummate care and skill. The list of culprits was published in small instalments so that hundreds of politicians had to live on tenterhooks morning after morning. Drumont's journal and with it the entire antisemitic press and movement emerged at last as a dangerous force in the Third Republic.

The Panama scandal, which, in Drumont's phrase, rendered the invisible visible,<sup>29</sup> brought with it two revelations. First, it disclosed that the members of Parliament and civil servants had become businessmen. Secondly, it showed that the intermediaries between private enterprise (in this case, the company) and the machinery of the state were almost exclusively Jews.<sup>30</sup> In France, as in all European countries where they had obtained emancipation, Jews had become, during a period of 150 years, closely connected with the finances of the state. In the eighteenth century this had taken the form of direct subsidies and war supplies fur-

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Frank, *op. cit.*, in the chapter headed "Panama;" cf. Suarez, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

<sup>28</sup> The quarrel between Reinach and Herz lends to the Panama scandal an air of gangsterism unusual in the nineteenth century. In his resistance to Herz's blackmail Reinach went so far as to recruit the aid of former police inspectors in placing a price of ten thousand francs on the head of his rival; cf. Suarez, *ibid.*, p. 157.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Drumont, Edouard, *Les tréteaux du succès: les héros et les pitres* (Paris 1901) p. 229 ff.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Levaillant, "La Genèse de l'antisémitisme sous la troisième République," in *Revue des études juives*, vol. liii (1907) p. 97.

nished by Jewish financiers. Thereafter, however, it had developed into a thriving business in the underwriting of state bonds, with the practical result that the latter were scarcely ever bought by the public unless endorsed by Jewish banking houses. From the restoration of the Bourbons down to the time of the Second Empire this important branch of national economy had been pretty well monopolized by the Rothschilds. An attempt by their rivals, Péreires Brothers, to wrest it out of their hands by establishing the *Crédit Mobilier* ended in a compromise. Although, as we shall see, the creation of the republic seriously weakened this exclusive control by the Jews, they were still powerful enough in 1882 to drive into bankruptcy the Catholic Union Générale, the real purpose of which was to ruin Jewish bankers.<sup>31</sup>

When the Peace Treaty was drawn up in 1871 its financial provisions were handled both on the German and on the French side by Jewish bankers.<sup>32</sup> Germany was represented by Bleichröder to whom, as is well known, Bismarck owed the financing of the war against Austria in 1866, while French interests were represented by the Rothschilds. It was this fact which turned French antisemitism, hitherto harping on a social-demagogic note,<sup>33</sup> into a chauvinistic movement. The Jews were blamed for the defeat of France, whereas they really deserved some credit for directing the financial demands of Germany into reasonable channels. The truth of the matter is that since the Jews were an international element in Europe and represented international interests it was impossible to achieve the modern type of "peace through annihilation" so long as they had a hand in it. Immediately after the conclusion of the peace, the house of Rothschild embarked on an unprecedented policy: it came out in open sympathy for the monarchists and against the republic.<sup>34</sup> What was new in this was not the monarchist trend but the fact that for the

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Lazare, Bernard, *Contre l'antisémitisme: histoire d'une polémique* (Paris 1896).

<sup>32</sup> Cf. the report of the German entry into Paris, in *Figaro* (February 28, 1883). The report achieved notoriety through its reproduction by Drumont in his *La France juive* (Paris 1885) vol. I, p. 396.

<sup>33</sup> See especially Toussenel, *Les Juifs, rois de l'époque* (Paris 1846). For the development of antisemitic ideologies in France see also Hoberg, Cl. August, "Die geistigen Grundlagen des Antisemitismus im modernen Frankreich," in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* (Hamburg 1940) vol. IV.

<sup>34</sup> On the complicity of the Haute Banque in the Orleanist movement see Charensol, G., *L'Affaire Dreyfus et la Troisième République* (Paris 1930). One of the spokesmen of this powerful group was Arthur Meyer, publisher of the *Gaulois*. A baptized Jew, Meyer belonged to the most virulent section of the anti-Dreyfusards. See Clémenceau, *L'Iniquité*, in the article "Le spectacle du jour;" see also the entries in Hohenlohe's diary, in Herzog, *op. cit.*, under date of June 11, 1898.

first time an important Jewish financial power set itself in opposition to the current regime. Up to that time the Rothschilds had accommodated themselves to whatever political system was in power. It seemed, therefore, that the republic was the first form of government which really had no use for them.

Both the political influence and the social status of the Jews had for centuries been due to the fact that they were a closed group who worked directly for the state and were directly protected by it on account of their special services. Their close and immediate connection with the machinery of government was possible only so long as the state remained at a distance from the people, while the ruling classes continued to be indifferent as to its management. In such circumstances the Jews were, from the state's point of view, the most dependable element of society just because they did not really belong to it. The parliamentary system allowed the liberal bourgeoisie to gain control of the state machine. To this bourgeoisie, however, the Jews had never belonged and they therefore regarded it with a not unwarranted suspicion. The regime no longer needed the Jews as much as before since it was now possible to achieve through Parliament a financial expansion beyond the wildest dreams of the former more or less absolute or constitutional monarchs.

Thus the leading Jewish houses gradually faded from the scene of finance politics and betook themselves more and more to the antisemitic salons of the aristocracy, there to dream of financing reactionary movements designed to restore the good old days.<sup>35</sup> Meanwhile, however, other Jewish circles, newcomers among Jewish plutocrats were beginning to take an increasing part in the commercial life of the Third Republic. What the Rothschilds had almost forgotten and what had nearly cost them their power was the simple fact that once they withdrew, even for a moment, from active interest in a regime they immediately lost their influence not only upon cabinet circles but upon the Jews. The Jewish immigrants were the first to see their chance.<sup>36</sup> They realized only too well that the

<sup>35</sup> On current leanings toward Bonapartism see Frank, *op. cit.*, p. 419, based upon unpublished documents taken from the archives of the German ministry of foreign affairs.

<sup>36</sup> Jacques Reinach was born in Germany, received an Italian barony and was naturalized in France. Cornélius Herz was born in France, the son of Bavarian parents. Migrating to America in early youth, he acquired citizenship and amassed a fortune there. For further details, cf. Brogan, *op. cit.*, p. 268 ff.

Characteristic of the way in which native Jews disappeared from public office is the fact that as soon as the affairs of the Panama Company began to go badly, Lévy-Crémieux, its original financial adviser, was replaced by Reinach; see Brogan, *op. cit.*, book vi, chapter ii.

republic, as it had developed, was not the logical sequel of a united people's uprising. Out of the slaughter of some 20,000 Communards, out of military defeat and economic collapse what had in fact emerged was a regime whose capacity for government had been doubtful from its inception. So much, indeed, was this the case that within three years a society brought to the brink of ruin was clamoring for a dictator. And when it got one in the presidency of General MacMahon (whose only claim to distinction was his defeat at Sedan) that individual had promptly turned out to be a parliamentarian of the old school and after a few years (1879) he resigned. Meanwhile, however, the various elements of society, from the opportunists to the radicals and from the coalitionists to the extreme right, had made up their minds what kind of policies they required from their representatives and what methods they ought to employ. The right policy was defense of vested interests and the right method was corruption.<sup>87</sup>

It has been justly observed that at this period of French history every political party had its Jew, in the same way that every royal household once had its court-Jew.<sup>88</sup> The difference, however, was profound. Investment of Jewish capital in the state had helped to give the Jews a productive role in the economy of Europe. Without their assistance the eighteenth-century development of the national state and its independent civil service would have been inconceivable. It was, after all, to these court-Jews that Western Jewry owed its emancipation. The shady transactions of Reinach and his confederates did not even lead to permanent riches.<sup>89</sup> All they did was to shroud in yet deeper darkness the mysterious and scandalous relations between business and politics. These parasites upon a corrupt body served to provide a thoroughly decadent society with an exceedingly dangerous alibi. Since they were Jews it was possible

<sup>87</sup> Lachapelle, Georges, *Les Finances de la Troisième République* (Paris 1937) p. 54 ff., describes in detail how the bureaucracy gained control of public funds, how the Budget Commission was governed entirely by private interests and how after 1881 swindle, to quote Léon Say (a Jew), became the only law. With regard to the economic status of members of Parliament cf. Bernanos, *op. cit.*, p. 192: "Most of them, like Gambetta, lacked even a change of underclothes." The Panama scandal was preceded by the so-called "Wilson affair;" the President's son-in-law was found driving an open traffic in honors and decorations.

<sup>88</sup> As Frank remarks (*op. cit.*, p. 321 ff.), the right had its Arthur Meyer, Boulangerism its Alfred Naquet, the opportunists their Reinachs and the Radicals their Dr. Cornélius Herz.

<sup>89</sup> It is to them and to them alone that Drumont's charge applies (*Les tréteaux du succès*, p. 237): "Those great Jews who start from nothing and attain everything . . . they come from God knows where, live in a mystery, die in a guess. . . . They don't arrive, they jump up. . . . They don't die, they fade out."



to make scapegoats of them when public indignation had to be allayed. Afterwards things could go on the same old way. The antisemites could at once point to the Jewish parasites of a corrupt society in order to "prove" that all Jews everywhere were nothing but termites within the otherwise healthy body of the people. It did not matter to them that the corruption of the body politic had started without the help of Jews; that the policy of businessmen (in a bourgeois society to which Jews had not belonged) and their ideal of unlimited competition had led to the disintegration of the state in party politics; that the ruling classes had proved incapable any longer of protecting their own interests, let alone those of the country as a whole.<sup>40</sup> The antisemites who called themselves patriots introduced that new species of national feeling which consists primarily in a complete whitewash of one's own people and a sweeping condemnation of all others.

The Jews could remain a separate group outside of society only so long as a more or less homogeneous and stable state machine had a use for them and was interested in protecting them. The decay of the state machine brought about the dissolution of the closed ranks of Jewry, which had so long been bound up with it. The first sign of this appeared in the affairs conducted by newly naturalized French Jews over whom their native-born brethren had lost control in much the same way as occurred in the Germany of the inflation period. The newcomers filled the gaps between the commercial world and the state. Far more disastrous in its results was another process which likewise began at this time and which was imposed from above. The dissolution of the state into factions, while it disrupted the closed society of the Jews, did not force them into a vacuum in which they could go on vegetating outside of state and society. For that the Jews were too rich and, at a time when money was one of the salient requisites of power, too powerful. Rather did they tend to become absorbed into the variety of social "sets," in accordance with their political leanings or more frequently, their social connections. This, however, did not lead to their disappearance. On the contrary, they maintained certain relations with the state machine and continued, albeit in a crucially different form, to manipulate the business of the state. Thus,

<sup>40</sup> Herzog, *op. cit.*, p. 258-59: "The president of the republic, . . . the former leather merchant, taking superannuated Jewesses to bed; the cabinet ministers, related to the big bosses and the armament tycoons; the senators and civil servants drawing incomes as inactive supervisors of railroad and shipping companies; and the old dodderer who became governor of Paris because he was a relative or friend of someone who counted. . . . Can one have any regard for such a world?"

despite their known opposition to the Third Republic, it was none other than the Rothschilds who undertook the placement of the Russian loan while Arthur Meyer, though baptized and an avowed monarchist, was among those involved in the Panama scandal. Thus it came about that the newcomers in French Jewry who formed the principal links between private commerce and the machinery of government were followed by the native born. But if the Jews had previously constituted a strong, close-knit group, whose usefulness for the state was obvious, they were now split up into cliques, mutually antagonistic but all bent on the same purpose of helping society to batten on the state.

*The Alliance of the Army and Clergy Against the Republic*

Seemingly removed from all such factors, seemingly immune from all corruption, stood the army, a heritage from the Second Empire. The republic had never dared to dominate it, even when monarchistic sympathies and intrigues came to open expression during the Boulanger crisis. The officer class consisted then as before of the sons of those old aristocratic families whose ancestors, as emigrés, had fought against their fatherland during the revolutionary wars.<sup>41</sup> These officers were strongly under the influence of the clergy who ever since the Revolution had made a point of supporting reactionary and anti-republican movements. Their influence was perhaps equally strong over those officers who were of somewhat lower birth but who hoped, as a result of the Church's old practice of marking talent without regard to pedigree, to gain promotion with the help of the clergy.

In contrast to the shifting and fluid cliques of society and Parliament, where admission was easy and allegiance fickle, stood the rigorous exclusiveness of the army, so characteristic of the caste-system. Neither military life, professional honor nor *esprit de corps* was what held its officers together to form a reactionary bulwark against the republic and against all democratic influences. It was simply the tie of caste.<sup>42</sup> The refusal of the state to democratize the army and to subject it to the civil authorities entailed remarkable consequences. It made the army an entity outside of the nation and created an armed power whose loyalties could be turned in directions which none could foretell. That this caste-ridden power, if but left to itself, was neither for nor against anyone

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Gohier, Urbain, *L'Armée de Condé: mémorial de la trahison pour éclairer l'annuaire de l'armée sous la Troisième République* (Paris 1898).

<sup>42</sup> See the excellent anonymous article, "The Dreyfus Case: A Study of French opinion," in *The Contemporary Review*, vol. lxxiv (October, 1898).

is shown clearly by the story of the almost burlesque coup d'état in which, despite statements to the contrary, it was really unwilling to take part. Even its notorious monarchism was, in the final analysis, nothing but an excuse for preserving itself as an independent interest-group, ready to defend its privileges "without regard to and in despite of, even against the republic."<sup>43</sup> Contemporary journalists and later historians have made valiant efforts to explain the conflict between military and civil powers during the Dreyfus affair in terms of an antagonism between "businessmen and soldiers."<sup>44</sup> We know today, however, how unjustified is this indirectly antisemitic interpretation. The intelligence department of the general staff were themselves reasonably expert at business. Were they not trafficking as openly in forged *bordereaux* and selling them as nonchalantly to foreign military attachés as a leather merchant might traffic in skins or the son-in-law of the president in honors and distinctions? Indeed, the zeal of Schwartzkoppen, the German attaché, who was anxious to discover more military secrets than France had to hide, must have been a positive source of embarrassment to these gentlemen of the counter-espionage service who, after all, could sell no more than they produced.

It was the great mistake of Catholic politicians to imagine that, in pursuit of their European policy, they could make use of the French army simply because it appeared to be anti-republican. The Church was, in fact, slated to pay for this error with the loss of its entire political influence in France.<sup>45</sup> When the department of intelligence finally emerged as a common fake-factory<sup>46</sup> no one in France, not even the army, was so seriously compromised as the Church. Towards the end of the last century the Catholic clergy had been seeking to recover its old political power in just those quarters where, for one or another reason, secular authority was on the wane among the people. Cases in point were those of Spain, where a decadent feudal aristocracy had brought about the economic and cultural ruin of the country, and Austria-Hungary, where a conflict of nationalities

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Luxemburg, *loc. cit.*: "The reason the army was reluctant to make a move was that it wanted to show its opposition to the civil power of the republic, without at the same time losing the force of that opposition by committing itself to a monarchy."

<sup>44</sup> It is under this caption that Maximilian Harden (a German Jew) described the Dreyfus case in *Die Zukunft* (1898). Walter Frank, the antisemitic historian, employs the same slogan in the heading of his chapter on Dreyfus while Bernanos (*op. cit.*, p. 413) remarks in the same vein that "rightly or wrongly, democracy sees in the military its most dangerous rival."

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Lecanuet, Father Edouard, *Les Signes avant-coureurs de la séparation, 1894-1910* (Paris 1930).

<sup>46</sup> Esterhazy, who was in a position to know, described the second bureau as a "fake factory;" cf. Weil, Bruno, *L'Affaire Dreyfus* (Paris 1930) p. 169.

was threatening daily to disrupt the state. And such too was the case in France, where the nation appeared to be sinking fast into the slough of conflicting interests.<sup>47</sup>

In France, as in Spain, the prosecution of this policy was mainly in the hands of the Jesuits. Working deviously through members of the general staff they had cunningly jockeyed themselves into a position where they could rely on the military "higher-ups" to help them turn the army into a "state within a state."<sup>48</sup> The Army—left in a political vacuum by the Third Republic—gladly accepted this guidance which at least provided for civilian leadership without which the military lose their "raison d'être (which) is to defend the principle embodied in civilian society"—as Clémenceau put it.

The Catholic Church then owed its popularity to the widespread popular skepticism which saw in the republic and in democracy the loss of all order, security and political will. To many the hierarchic system of the Church seemed the only escape from chaos. Indeed, it was this, rather than any religious revivalism, which caused the clergy to be held in respect.<sup>49</sup> As a matter of fact, the staunchest supporters of the Church at that period were the exponents of that so-called "cerebral" Catholicism, the "Catholics without faith," who were henceforth to dominate the entire monarchist and extreme nationalist movement. Without believing in their other-worldly basis, these "Catholics" clamored for more power to all authoritarian institutions. This, indeed, had been the line first laid down by Drumont and later endorsed by Maurras.<sup>50</sup>

The large majority of the Catholic clergy, deeply involved in political maneuvers, followed a policy of accommodation. In this, as the Dreyfus affair makes clear, they were conspicuously successful. Thus, when Victor Basch took up the cause for a retrial his house at Rennes was stormed under the leadership of three priests,<sup>51</sup> while no less distinguished a figure than the Dominican Father Didon called on the students of the Collège D'Arcueil to "draw the sword, terrorize, cut off heads and run

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Clémenceau, "La Croisade," in *L'Iniquité*: "Spain is writhing under the yoke of the Roman Church. Italy appears to have succumbed. The only countries left are Catholic Austria, already in her death-struggle, and the France of the Revolution, against which the papal hosts are even now deployed."

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Herzog, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Bernanos, *op. cit.*, p. 152: "The point cannot be sufficiently repeated: the real beneficiaries of that movement of reaction which followed the fall of the empire and the defeat were the clergy. Thanks to them national reaction assumed after 1873 the character of a religious revival."

<sup>50</sup> On Drumont and the origin of "cerebral Catholicism," see Bernanos, *op. cit.*, p. 127 ff.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Herzog, *op. cit.*, under date of January 21, 1898.

amok."<sup>52</sup> Similar too was the outlook of the three hundred lesser clerics who immortalized themselves in the "Henry Memorial," a monument for all time to the shocking corruption of the French people at that date.<sup>53</sup> During the period of the Dreyfus crisis it was not her regular clergy, not her ordinary religious orders and certainly not her *homines religiosi* who influenced the political line of the Catholic Church. As far as Europe was concerned, her reactionary policies in France, Austria and Spain, as well as her support of antisemitic trends in Vienna, Paris and Algiers were probably an immediate consequence of Jesuit influence. It was the Jesuits who had always best represented, both in the written and spoken word, the antisemitic school of the Catholic clergy.<sup>54</sup> This is largely the consequence of their statutes according to which each novice must prove that he has no Jewish blood back to the fourth generation.<sup>55</sup> And since the beginning of the nineteenth century the direction of the Church's international policy had passed into their hands.<sup>56</sup>

### *Assimilation and Antisemitism*

We have already observed how the dissolution of the state machinery facilitated the entry of the Rothschilds into the circles of the antisemitic

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Lécaneu, *op. cit.*, p. 182.

<sup>53</sup> The *Libre Parole's* list of subscribers to a fund for the benefit of Madame Henry, widow of the Colonel who had committed suicide while in prison (see above, note 14) is one of the most important of the contemporary documents, since the subscribers were not content with furnishing cash but also took the opportunity of venting their views on the solution of the Jewish problem. Jews were to be torn to pieces, like Marsyas in the Greek myth. Reinach ought to be boiled alive. Jews should be stewed in oil, or pierced to death with needles; they should be "circumcized up to the neck." One group of officers could scarcely wait to try out the new types of guns on the 100,000 Jews who were infesting the country. Among the subscribers were more than 1,000 officers, including four generals in active service, and the minister of war, Mercier. There was also a large number of intellectuals including, strangely enough, Paul Valéry, who contributed three francs, "non sans réflexion." Even Jews figure in the list, among them the convert, Arthur Meyer, and Gaston Pollonius of the *Soir*.

<sup>54</sup> Koch, L. S. J., in *Jesuiten-Lexikon* (Paderborn 1934), article "Juden": "Unter allen Orden ist die Gesellschaft Jesu also derjenige, dessen Verfassung am entschiedensten allen juedischen Einfluss abwehrt."

<sup>55</sup> Originally, according to the Convention of 1593, all Christians of Jewish descent were excluded. A decree of 1608 stipulated reinvestigations back to the fifth generation; the last provision of 1923 reduced this to four generations. These requirements can be waived by the chief of the order in individual cases.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Boehmer, H., *Les Jésuites; traduction de l'allemand* (Paris 1910) p. 284: "Since 1820 . . . there has existed no such thing as independent national churches able to resist the Jesuit-dictated orders of the pope. The higher clergy of our day have pitched their tents in front of the Holy See and the Church has become what Bellarmine, the great Jesuit controversialist, always demanded it should become, an absolute monarchy whose policies can be directed by the Jesuits and whose development can be determined by pressing a button."

aristocracy. The fashionable set of Faubourg Saint-Germain opened its doors not only to a few ennobled Jews but their baptized sycophants, the antisemitic Jews, were also suffered to drift in.<sup>57</sup> Curiously enough, the Jews of Alsace, who like the Dreyfus family had moved to Paris following the cession of that territory, took an especially prominent part in this social climb. Their exaggerated patriotism came out most markedly in the way they strove to dissociate themselves from Jewish immigrants. The Dreyfus family belonged to that section of French Jewry which sought to assimilate even to the point of adopting antisemitism.<sup>58</sup> This adjustment to the French aristocracy had one inevitable result: the Jews tried to launch their sons upon the same higher military careers as were pursued by those of their new-found friends. It was here that the first cause of friction arose. The acceptance of the Jews into high society had been relatively peaceful. The upper classes, despite their dreams of a restored monarchy, were a politically spineless lot and did not bother themselves unduly either one way or the other. But when the Jews began seeking equality in the army, they came face to face with the determined opposition of the Jesuits who were not prepared to tolerate the existence of officers immune to the influence of the confessional.<sup>59</sup> Moreover, they

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Clémenceau, "Le spectacle du jour," in *L'Iniquité*: "Rothschild, friend of the entire antisemitic nobility . . . of a piece with Arthur Meyer, who is more papist than the Pope."

<sup>58</sup> On the Alsatian Jews, to whom Dreyfus belonged, see Foucault, André, "Un nouvel aspect de l'Affaire Dreyfus," in *Les Oeuvres Libres* (1938) §10: "In the eyes of the Jewish bourgeoisie of Paris they were the incarnation of nationalist *raideur* . . . that attitude of distant disdain which the gentry affects towards its *parvenu* co-religionists. Their desire to assimilate completely to Gallic modes, to live on intimate terms with our old-established families, to occupy the most distinguished positions in the state, and the contempt which they showed for the commercial elements of Jewry, for the recently naturalized 'Polaks' of Galicia, gave them almost the appearance of traitors against their own race. . . . The Dreyfuses of 1894? Why, they were antisemites!" Cf. also Marcel Proust's analysis of the new form of group-consciousness developed by the assimilated Jews of that generation, in the novel, *Sodom and Gomorra*, vol. i.

Herzog, *op. cit.*, under date of 1892 shows at length how the Rothschilds began to adapt themselves to the republic. Curiously enough the papal policy of coalitionism, which represents an attempt at rapprochement by the Catholic Church, dates from precisely the same year. It is therefore not impossible that the Rothschild line was influenced by the clergy. As for the loan of 500 million francs to Russia Count Münster pertinently observed: "Speculation is dead in France. . . . The capitalists can find no way of negotiating their securities . . . and this will contribute to the success of the loan. . . . The big Jews believe that if they make money they will best be able to help their small-time brethren. The result is that, though the French market is glutted with Russian securities, Frenchmen are still giving good francs for bad roubles;" Herzog, *ibid.*

<sup>59</sup> Cf. "K.V.T." in *The Contemporary Review*, vol. lxxiv, p. 598: "By the will of the democracy all Frenchmen are to be soldiers; by the will of the Church Catholics only are to hold the chief commands."

came up against an inveterate caste-spirit, which the easy atmosphere of the salons had led them to forget, a caste-spirit which already strengthened by tradition and calling was still further fortified by uncompromising hostility to the Third Republic and to the civil administration.

A modern historian has described the struggle between Jews and Jesuits as a "struggle between two rivals," in which the "higher Jesuit clergy and the Jewish plutocracy stood facing one another in the middle of France like two invisible lines of battle."<sup>60</sup> The description is so far true that the Jews found in the Jesuits their first unappeasable foes while the latter came promptly to realize how powerful a weapon antisemitism could be. This was the first attempt and the only one prior to Hitler to exploit "the major political concept"<sup>61</sup> of antisemitism on a pan-European scale. On the other hand, however, if it be assumed that the struggle was one of two equally matched "rivals" the description is palpably false. For one thing the Jews never declared war. For another the Jews sought no higher degree of power than was being wielded by any of the other cliques into which the republic had split. All they desired at the time was sufficient influence to pursue their social and business interests. They did not aspire to a political share in the management of the state. The only organized group who sought that were the Jesuits. The trial of Dreyfus was preceded by a number of incidents which show how resolutely and energetically the Jews tried to gain a place in the army and how common, even at that time, was the hostility towards them. Subjected ever to gross insult, such few Jewish officers as there were, were obliged constantly to fight duels while gentile comrades were unwilling to act as their seconds. It is, indeed, in this connection that the infamous Esterhazy first comes upon the scene as an exception to the rule.<sup>62</sup>

<sup>60</sup> Herzog, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Bernanos, *op. cit.*, p. 151: "So, shorn of ridiculous hyperbole, antisemitism showed itself for what it really is: not a mere piece of crankiness, a mental quirk but a major political concept."

<sup>62</sup> See Esterhazy's letter of July, 1894 to Edmond de Rothschild, quoted by Reinach, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 53 ff.: "I did not hesitate when Captain Crémieux could find no Christian officer to act as his second." Cf. Reinach, T., *Histoire sommaire de l'Affaire Dreyfus*, p. 60 ff. See also Herzog, *op. cit.*, under date of 1892 and June, 1894, where these duels are listed in detail and all of Esterhazy's intermediaries named. The last occasion was in September, 1896 when he received 10,000 francs. This misplaced generosity was later to have disquieting results. When, from the comfortable security of England, Esterhazy at length made his revelations and thereby compelled a revision of the case the antisemitic press naturally suggested that he had been paid by the Jews for his self-condemnation. The idea is still advanced as a major argument in favor of Dreyfus' guilt.

It has always remained somewhat obscure whether the arrest and condemnation of Dreyfus was simply a judicial error which just happened by chance to light up a political conflagration or whether the general staff deliberately planted the forged *bordereau* for the express purpose of at last branding a Jew as a traitor. In favor of the latter hypothesis lies the fact that Dreyfus was the first Jew to find a post on the general staff and under existing conditions this could not but have aroused not merely annoyance but positive fury and consternation. In any case anti-Jewish hatred was unleashed even before the verdict was returned. Contrary to custom, which demanded the withholding of all information in a spy-case still *sub iudice*, officers of the general staff cheerfully supplied the *Libre Parole* with details of the case and the name of the accused. Apparently they feared lest Jewish influence with the government lead to a suppression of the trial and a stifling of the whole business. Some show of plausibility was afforded these fears by the fact that certain circles of French Jewry were known at the time to be seriously concerned about the precarious situation of Jewish officers.

It must also be remembered that the Panama scandal was then fresh in the public mind and that following the Rothschild loan to Russia distrust of the Jews had grown considerably. War Minister Mercier was not only lauded by the bourgeois press at every fresh turn of the trial but even Jaurès' paper, the organ of the socialists, congratulated him on "having opposed the formidable pressure of corrupt politicians and high finance."<sup>63</sup> Characteristically this encomium drew from the *Libre Parole* the unstinted commendation, "Bravo, Jaurès!" Two years later, when Bernard Lazare published his first pamphlet on the miscarriage of justice, Jaurès' paper carefully refrained from discussing its contents but charged the socialist author with being an admirer of Rothschild and probably a paid agent.<sup>64</sup> Similarly, as late as 1897, when the fight for Dreyfus' reinstatement had already begun, Jaurès could see nothing in it but the conflict of two bourgeois groups, the opportunists and the clerics. Finally, even after the Rennes retrial Wilhelm Liebknecht, the German social democrat, still believed in the guilt of Dreyfus because he could not imagine that a member of the upper classes could ever be the victim of a false verdict.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Reinach, J., *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 471.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Herzog, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Kohler, Max J., "Some New Light on the Dreyfus Case," in *Studies in Jewish Bibliography and Related Subjects in Memory of A. S. Freidus* (New York 1929) p. 293-318.



The skepticism of the radical and socialist press, strongly colored as it was by anti-Jewish feelings, was strengthened by the bizarre tactics of the Dreyfus family in its attempt to secure a retrial. In trying to save an innocent man they employed the very methods usually adopted in the case of a guilty one. They stood in mortal terror of publicity and relied exclusively on back-door maneuvers.<sup>66</sup> They were lavish with their cash<sup>67</sup> and treated Lazare, one of their most valuable helpers and one of the greatest figures, as if he were their paid agent.<sup>68</sup> Clémenceau, Zola, Picquard and Labori—to name but the more active of the Dreyfusards—could in the end only save their good names by dissociating their efforts, with greater or less fuss and publicity, from the more concrete aspects of the issue.<sup>69</sup>

There was only one basis on which Dreyfus could or should have been saved. The intrigues of a corrupt Parliament, the dry rot of a collapsing society and the clergy's lust for power should have been met squarely with the stern Jacobin concept of the nation based upon human rights—that republican view of communal life which asserts that (in the words of Clémenceau) by infringing on the rights of one you infringe on the rights of all. To rely on Parliament or on society was to lose the fight before beginning it. For one thing the resources of Jewry were in no way superior to those of the rich Catholic bourgeoisie; for another all of the higher strata of society, from the clerical and aristocratic families of Faubourg St.-Germain to the anti-clerical and radical petty bourgeoisie,

<sup>66</sup> The Dreyfus family, for instance, summarily rejected the suggestion of Arthur Lévy, the writer, and Lévy-Bruhl, the scholar, that they should circulate a petition of protest among all leading figures of public life. Instead they embarked on a series of personal approaches to any one or another politician with whom they happened to have contact; cf. Dutrait-Crozon, *op. cit.*, p. 51. See also Foucault, *op. cit.*, p. 309: "At this distance, one may wonder at the fact that the French Jews, instead of working on the papers secretly did not give adequate and open expression to their indignation."

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Herzog, *op. cit.*, under date of December, 1894 and January, 1898. See also Charensol, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Péguy, Charles, "Le Portrait de Bernard Lazare," in *Cahiers de la quinzaine*, series xi, no. 2 (1910).

<sup>69</sup> Labori's withdrawal, after Dreyfus' family had hurriedly withdrawn the brief from him while the Rennes tribunal was still sitting, caused a major scandal. An exhaustive, if greatly exaggerated, account will be found in Frank, *op. cit.*, p. 432. Labori's own statement, which speaks eloquently for his nobility of character, appeared in *La Grande Revue* (February, 1900) 337. After what had happened to his counsel and friend Zola at once broke relations with the Dreyfus family. As for Picquard, the *Echo de Paris* (November 30, 1901) reported that after Rennes he had nothing more to do with the Dreyfuses. Clémenceau in face of the fact that the whole of France, or even the whole world, grasped the real meaning of the trials better than the accused or his family, was more inclined to take the incident as humorous; cf. Weil, *op. cit.*, p. 307-8.

were only too willing to see the Jews formally removed from the body politic. In this way, they reckoned, they would be able to purge themselves of possible taint. The loss of Jewish social and commercial contacts seemed to them a price well worth paying. Similarly, as the utterances of Jaurès indicate, the affair was regarded by Parliament as a golden opportunity for rehabilitating, or rather regaining, its time-honored reputation for incorruptibility. Last, but by no means least, in the countenancing of such slogans as "Death to the Jews" or "France for the French" there had been discovered what was almost a magical formula for reconciling the masses to the existent state of government and society.

### *The People and the Mob*

If it be the common error of our time to imagine that propaganda can achieve all things and that a man can be talked into anything provided the talking is sufficiently loud and cunning, so in that period it was commonly believed that the "voice of the people was the voice of God," and that the task of a leader was, as Clémenceau so scornfully expressed it,<sup>70</sup> to follow that voice shrewdly. Both views go back to the same fundamental error of regarding the mob as identical with rather than as a caricature of the people.

The mob is primarily a group in which the residue of all classes are represented. This makes it so easy to mistake the mob for the people, which also comprises all strata of society. While the people in all great revolutions fights for true representation, the mob always will shout for the "strong man," the "great leader." For the mob hates society from which it is excluded, as well as Parliament where it is not represented. Plebiscites, therefore, with which modern mob-leaders have obtained such excellent results, are an old concept of politicians who rely upon the mob. One of the more intelligent leaders of the anti-Dreyfusards, Déroulède already clamored for a "Republic through plebiscite."

High society and politicians of the Third Republic had produced the French mob in a series of scandals and public frauds. They now felt a tender sentiment of parental familiarity towards their off-spring, a feeling mixed with admiration and fear.<sup>71</sup> The mob, they knew, was

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Clémenceau in *L'Iniquité* (February 2, 1898). On the futility of trying to win the workers with the antisemitic slogans and especially on the attempts of Léon Daudet, see the royalist writer Dimier, *Vingt ans d'Action Française* (Paris 1926).

<sup>71</sup> Very characteristic in this respect are the various depictions of contemporary society in Reinach, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 233 ff.; vol. iii, p. 141: "Society hostesses fell in step with

flesh of their flesh and blood of their blood. Even a Jewish historian of the time, although he had seen with his own eyes that Jews are no longer safe when the mob rules the street, speaks with secret admiration of the "great collective movement."<sup>72</sup> This shows only how deeply most Jews were rooted in a society which was attempting to eliminate them.

If Bernanos, with reference to the Dreyfus affair, describes anti-semitism as a major political concept, he is undoubtedly right with respect to the mob. It had been tried out previously in Berlin and Vienna, in the Ahlwardt movement and the Lueger campaign, but nowhere was its efficacy more clearly proved than in France. There can be no doubt that in the eyes of the mob the Jews came to serve as an object-lesson of all the things they detested. If they hated society they could point to the way in which the Jews were tolerated within it; and if they hated the government they could point to the way in which the Jews had been protected by or were identifiable with the state. While it is a mistake to assume that the mob preys only on Jews, the Jews must be accorded first place among its favorite victims.

Excluded as it is from society and political representation the mob turns of necessity to extra-parliamentary action. Moreover, it is inclined to seek the real forces of political life in those movements and influences which are hidden from view and work behind the scenes. There can be no doubt that during the nineteenth century Jewry fell into this category as did Freemasonry (especially in Latin countries) and the Jesuits.<sup>73</sup> It is, of course, utterly untrue that any of these groups really constituted a secret society bent on dominating the world by means of a gigantic conspiracy. Nevertheless, it is true that their influence, however overt it may have been, was exerted beyond the formal realm of politics, operating on a large scale in lobbies, lodges and the confessional. Ever since the

Guérin. Their language (which scarcely outran their thoughts) would have struck horror in the Amazon of Damohey . . ." Of special interest in this connection is an article by Chevrillon, André, "Huit Jours à Rennes," in *La Grande Revue* (February 1900). He relates, *inter alia*, the following revealing incident: "A physician speaking to some friends of mine about Dreyfus, chanced to remark, 'I'd like to torture him.' 'And I wish,' rejoined one of the ladies, 'that he were innocent. Then he'd suffer more.'" These are side-remarks. The standard-work for this relationship between mob and high society is of course the Henry Memorial. See note 53.

<sup>72</sup> Reinach, *op. cit.*, i, p. 233.

<sup>73</sup> A study of European superstition would probably show that Jews became objects of this typically nineteenth-century brand of superstition fairly late. They were preceded by the Rosicrucians, Templars, Jesuits and Freemasons. The treatment of nineteenth-century history suffers greatly from the lack of such a study.

French Revolution these three groups have shared the doubtful honor of being, in the eyes of the European mob, the pivotal point of world politics. During the Dreyfus crisis each was able to exploit this popular notion by hurling at the other charges of conspiring to world domination. The slogan, "secret Judah," is due, no doubt, to the inventiveness of certain Jesuits, who chose to see in the first Zionist Congress (1897) the core of a Jewish world conspiracy.<sup>74</sup> Similarly, the concept of "secret Rome" is due to the anti-clerical Freemasons and perhaps to the indiscreet slanders of some Jews as well.

The fickleness of the mob is proverbial, as the opponents of Dreyfus were to learn to their sorrow when, in 1899, the wind changed and the small group of true republicans, headed by Clémenceau, suddenly realized, with mixed feelings, that a section of the mob had rallied to their side.<sup>75</sup> In some eyes the two parties to the great controversy seemed now like "two rival gangs of charlatans squabbling for recognition by the rabble"<sup>76</sup> while actually the voice of the Jacobin Clémenceau had succeeded in bringing back one part of the French people to their greatest tradition. Thus the great scholar, Emile Duclaux, could write: "In this drama played before a whole people and so worked up by the press that the whole nation ultimately took part in it, we see the chorus and anti-chorus of the ancient tragedy railing at each other. The scene is France and the theater is the world."

Led by the Jesuits and aided by the mob the army at last stepped into the fray confident of victory. Counter-attack from the civil power had been effectively forestalled. The antisemitic press had stopped men's mouths by publishing Reinach's lists of the deputies involved in the Panama scandal.<sup>77</sup> Everything suggested an effortless triumph. The society and the politicians of the Third Republic, its scandals and affairs had created a new class of *déclassés*; they could not be expected to fight against their own product; on the contrary, they were to adopt the language and outlook of the mob. Through the army the Jesuits would

<sup>74</sup> See "Il caso Dreyfus," in *Civiltà Cattolica* (February 5, 1898).

<sup>75</sup> Cf. du Gard, *Jean Barrois*, p. 272 ff., and Halévy, Daniel, in *Cahiers de la quinzaine*, series xi, cahier 10 (Paris 1910).

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Sorel, Georges, *La Révolution dreyfusienne* (Paris 1911) p. 70-71.

<sup>77</sup> To what extent the hands of members of parliament were tied is shown by the case of Scheurer-Kestner, one of their better elements and vice-president of the senate. No sooner had he entered his protest against the trial than *Libre Parole* proclaimed the fact that his son-in-law had been involved in the Panama scandal. See Herzog, *op. cit.*, under date of November, 1897.

gain the upper hand over the corrupt civil power and the way would thus be paved for a bloodless coup d'état.

### *Dreyfusards and Anti-Dreyfusards*

So long as there was only the Dreyfus family trying with its bizarre methods to rescue its kinsman from Devil's Island and so long as there were only Jews concerned about their standing in the antisemitic salons and the still more antisemitic army, everything certainly pointed that way. Obviously there was no reason to expect an attack on the army or on society from *that* quarter. Was not the sole desire of the Jews to continue to be accepted in society and suffered in the armed forces? No one in military or civilian circles needed to give himself a sleepless night on *their* account.<sup>78</sup> It was disconcerting, therefore, when it transpired that in the intelligence office of the general staff there sat a high officer, who, though possessed of a good Catholic background, excellent military prospects and the "proper" degree of antipathy toward the Jews, had yet not adopted the principle that the end justifies the means. Such a man, utterly divorced from social clannishness or professional ambition, was Picquard, and of this simple, quiet, politically disinterested spirit the general staff was soon to have its fill. Picquard was no hero and certainly no martyr. He was simply that common type of citizen with an average interest in public affairs who in the hour of danger (though not a minute earlier) stands up to defend his country in the same unquestioning way as he discharges his daily duties.<sup>79</sup> Nevertheless, the cause only grew serious when, after several delays and hesitations, Clémenceau at last became convinced that Dreyfus was innocent and the republic in danger. At the beginning of the struggle only a handful of well-known writers and scholars rallied to the cause, Zola, Anatole France, E. Duclaux, Gabriel Monod, the historian, and Lucien Herr, librarian of the École Normale. To these must be added the small and then insignificant circle of young intellectuals who were later to make history in the *Cahiers de la*

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Brogan, *op. cit.*, book vii, ch. i: "The desire to let the matter rest was not uncommon among French Jews, especially among the richer French Jews."

<sup>79</sup> Immediately after he had made his discoveries Picquard was banished to a dangerous post in Tunis. Thereupon he made his will, exposed the whole business and deposited a copy of the document with his lawyer. A few months later, when it was discovered that he was still alive, a deluge of mysterious letters came pouring in, compromising him and accusing him of complicity with the "traitor" Dreyfus. He was treated like a gangster who had threatened to "squeal." When all this proved of no avail, he was arrested, drummed out of the army and divested of his decorations, all of which he endured with quiet equanimity.

*quinzaine*.<sup>80</sup> That, however, was the full measure of his allies. There was no political group, not a single politician of repute, ready to stand at his side. The greatness of Clémenceau's approach lies in the fact that it was not directed against a particular miscarriage of justice, but was based upon such "abstract" ideas as justice, liberty and civic virtue. It was based, in short, on those very concepts which had formed the staple of old-time Jacobin patriotism and against which much mud and abuse had already been hurled. As time wore on and Clémenceau continued, unmoved by threats and disappointments, to enunciate the same truths and to embody them into demands, the more "concrete" nationalists lost ground. Followers of men like Barrès, who had accused the supporters of Dreyfus of losing themselves in a "welter of metaphysics," came to realize that the abstractions of the "Tiger" were actually nearer to political realities than the limited intelligence of ruined businessmen or the barren traditionalism of fatalistic intellectuals.<sup>81</sup>

Although antisemitism had undoubtedly gained ground during the three years following the arrest of Dreyfus, before the opening of Clémenceau's campaign, and although the anti-Jewish press had attained a circulation comparable to the chief papers', the streets had remained quiet. It was only when Clémenceau began his articles in *L'Aurore*, when Zola published his *J'Accuse* and when the Rennes tribunal set off the dismal succession of trials and retrials that the mob stirred into action. Every stroke of the Dreyfusards (who were known to be a small minority) was followed by a more or less violent disturbance on the streets.<sup>82</sup> The organization of the mob by the general staff was remarkable. The trail

<sup>80</sup> To this group belonged the youthful Romain Rolland, Suarez, Georges Sorel, Daniel Halévy and Bernard Lazare. The most famous of them was Charles Péguy.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Barrès, M., *Scènes et doctrines du nationalisme* (Paris 1899 and 1925) p. 12: "I can live only after the manner of my dead ancestors. They and my country demand a certain activity," and "Nationalism is the acceptance of a certain determinism" (p. 8). The plight of the intellectuals is illustrated by Simon's (*op. cit.*, p. 54-55) priceless story of how Charles Maurras had "the honor and pleasure," after the fall of France, of falling in during his flight with a female astrologer who interpreted to him the political meaning of recent events, advising him to collaborate with the Nazis.

<sup>82</sup> The faculty rooms of Rennes University were wrecked after five professors had declared themselves in favor of a retrial. After the appearance of Zola's first article Royalist students demonstrated outside the offices of *Figaro*, after which the paper desisted from further articles of the same type. The publisher of the pro-Dreyfus *La Bataille* was beaten up on the street. The judges of the Court of Cassation, which finally set aside the verdict of 1894, reported unanimously that they had been threatened with "unlawful assault." Examples could be multiplied.

leads straight from the army to the *Libre Parole* which, directly or indirectly, through its articles or the personal intervention of its editors, mobilized students, monarchists, adventurers and plain gangsters and pushed them into the streets. Did Zola utter a word, at once his windows were stoned. Did Scheurer-Kestner write to the colonial minister, he was at once beaten up on the streets while the papers made scurrilous attacks on his private life. And all accounts agree that if Zola, when once charged, had been acquitted he would never have left the courtroom alive.

The cry, "Death to the Jews," swept the country. In Lyons, Rennes, Nantes, Tours, Bordeaux, Clermont-Ferrant and Marseilles—everywhere, in fact—antisemitic riots broke out and were invariably traceable to the same source. Popular indignation broke out everywhere on the same day and at precisely the same hour.<sup>83</sup> Under the leadership of Guérin the mob took on a military complexion. Antisemitic shock troops appeared on the streets and made certain that every pro-Dreyfus meeting should end in bloodshed. The complicity of the police was everywhere patent.<sup>84</sup>

The most modern figure on the side of the anti-Dreyfusards was probably Jules Guérin. Ruined in business, he had begun his political career as a police stool pigeon. At that time he had been, of course, quite unconscious of the heights to which this humble office was ultimately to lead his principal. Nevertheless, it had given him a thorough mastery of that discipline and flair for organization which invariably marks the underworld. This he was later able to divert into political channels, becoming the founder and head of the Ligue Antisémite. In him high society found its first criminal hero. In its adulation of Guérin bourgeois society showed clearly that in its code of morals and ethics it had broken for good with its own standards. Behind the Ligue stood two members of the aristocracy, the Duke of Orléans and the Marquis de Morès. The latter had lost his fortune in America and became famous for organizing the butchers of Paris into a manslaughtering brigade.

Most eloquent of these modern tendencies was the farcical siege of

<sup>83</sup> Antisemitic demonstrations took place, on January 18, 1898, at Bordeaux, Marseille, Clermont-Ferrant, Nantes, Rouen and Lyon. On the following day student riots broke out in Rouen, Toulouse and Nantes.

<sup>84</sup> The crudest instance was that of the police prefect of Rennes, who advised Professor Victor Basch, when the latter's house was stormed by a mob 2,000 strong, that he ought to hand in his resignation, as he could no longer guarantee his safety.

the so-called Fort Chabrol. It was here, in this first of "Brown Houses," that the cream of the Ligue Antisémitique foregathered when the police decided at last to arrest their leader. The installations were the acme of technical perfection. "The windows were protected by iron shutters. There was a system of electric bells and telephones from cellar to roof. Five yards or so behind the massive entrance, itself always kept locked and bolted, there was a tall grill of cast iron. On the right, between the grill and the main entrance was a small door, likewise iron-plated, behind which sentries, handpicked from the butcher legions, mounted guard day and night."<sup>85</sup> Max Régis, instigator of the Algerian pogroms, is another who strikes a modern note. It was this youthful Régis who once called upon a cheering Paris rabble to "water the tree of freedom with the blood of the Jews." Régis represented that section of the movement which hoped to achieve power by legal and parliamentary methods. In accordance with this program he had himself elected mayor of Algiers and utilized his office to unleash the pogroms in which several Jews were killed, Jewish women criminally assaulted and some 158 Jewish-owned stores looted.<sup>86</sup> It was to him also that the polished and cultured Edouard Drumont, that most famous French antisemite, owed his seat in parliament.

What was new in all this was not the activity of the mob; for that there were abundant precedents. What was new and surprising at the time—though all too familiar to us—was the organization of the mob and the hero-worship enjoyed by its leaders. The mob became the direct agent of that "concrete" nationalism espoused by Barrès, Maurras and Daudet, who together formed what was undoubtedly a kind of élite of the younger intellectuals. These men, who despised the people and who had themselves but recently emerged from a ruinous and decadent cult of estheticism, saw in the mob a living expression of virile and primitive "strength." It was they and their theories which first identified the mob with the people and converted its leaders into national heroes.<sup>87</sup> It was their philosophy of pessimism (of which Baudelaire had been the greatest

<sup>85</sup> Cf. Bernanos, *op. cit.*, p. 346.

<sup>86</sup> The figures are those of Lecanuet, *op. cit.*, p. 160 ff.

<sup>87</sup> For these theories see especially Maurras, Charles, *Au Signe de Flore; souvenirs de la vie politique l'Affaire Dreyfus, la fondation de l'Action Française* (Paris 1931); Barrès, M., *Scènes et doctrines du nationalisme*; Daudet, Léon, *Panorama de la Troisième République* (Paris 1936).



forerunner) that paved the way for the ultimate collapse of the European intelligentsia.

Even Clémenceau was not immune from the temptation to identify the mob with the people.<sup>88</sup> What made him especially prone to this error was the consistently ambiguous attitude of the Labor party toward the question of "abstract" justice. No party, including the socialists, was yet ready to make an issue of justice *per se*.<sup>89</sup> The socialists stood for the interests of the workers, as the opportunists for those of the liberal bourgeoisie, as the coalitionists for those of the Catholic higher classes and the radicals for those of the anti-clerical petty bourgeoisie. The socialists had the great advantage of speaking in the name of a homogeneous and united class. Unlike the bourgeois parties they did not represent a society which had split into innumerable cliques and cabals. Nevertheless, they were concerned primarily and essentially with the interests of their class. They were not troubled by any higher obligation towards human solidarity and had no conception of what communal life really meant. Typical of their attitude was the observation of Jules Guesde, the counterpart of Jaurès in the French party, that "law and honor are mere words."<sup>90</sup>

The nihilism which characterized the nationalists was no monopoly of the anti-Dreyfusards. On the contrary, a large proportion of the socialists and many of those who championed Dreyfus, like Guesde, spoke the same language. If the Catholic *La Croix* remarked that "it is no longer a question whether Dreyfus is innocent or guilty but only of who will win, the friends of the army or its foes," the corresponding sentiment might well have been voiced, *mutatis mutandis*, by the partisans of Dreyfus.<sup>91</sup> Not only the mob but a considerable section of the French people declared itself as, at best, quite uninterested whether one group of the population was or was not to be excluded from the law.<sup>92</sup>

As soon as the mob began its campaign of terror against the partisans of Dreyfus, it found the path open before it. As Clémenceau attests,

<sup>88</sup> This comes out most clearly in his preface to *Contre la justice*.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. Clémenceau, "À la dérive," in *L'Iniquité*: "There is no party ready to stand, come what may, for justice, the sole unbreakable bond of union between civilized men."

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Herzog, *op. cit.*, p. 217.

<sup>91</sup> It was precisely this which so greatly disillusioned the champions of Dreyfus, especially the circle around Charles Péguy. This disturbing similarity between Dreyfusards and anti-Dreyfusards is the subject-matter of the instructive novel by du Gard, *Jean Barrois*.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. Clémenceau, "Après l'attaque," in *L'Iniquité*.

the workers of Paris cared little for the whole affair. If the various elements of the bourgeoisie squabbled among themselves, that, they thought, scarcely affected their own interests.

With the open consent of the people [wrote Clémenceau] they have proclaimed before the world the failure of their "democracy." Through them a sovereign people shows itself thrust from its throne of justice, shorn of its infallible majesty. For there is no denying that this evil has befallen us with the full complicity of the people itself. . . . The people is not God. Anyone could have foreseen that this new divinity would some day topple to his fall. A collective tyrant, spread over the length and breadth of the land, is no more acceptable than a single tyrant ensconced upon his throne.<sup>93</sup>

At last Clémenceau convinced Jaurès that an infringement of the rights of one man was an infringement of the rights of all. But in this he was successful only because the wrongdoers happened to be the inveterate enemies of the people ever since the Revolution, namely, the aristocracy and the clergy. It was *against* the rich and the clergy, not *for* the republic, not *for* justice and freedom that the workers finally took to the streets. True, both the speeches of Jaurès and the articles of Clémenceau are redolent of the old revolutionary passion for human rights. True also that this passion was strong enough to rally the people to the struggle, but first they had to be convinced that not only justice and the honor of the republic were at stake but their own class "interests." As it was, a large number of socialists, both inside and outside the country, still regarded it as a mistake to meddle (as they put it) in the internecine quarrels of the bourgeoisie or to bother about saving the republic.

The first to wean the workers, at least partially, from this mood of indifference was that great lover of the people, Emile Zola. In his famous indictment of the republic he was also, however, the first to deflect from the presentation of precise political facts and to yield to the passions of the mob by raising the bogey of "secret Rome." This was a note which Clémenceau adopted but reluctantly, though Jaurès with enthusiasm. The real achievement of Zola, which is hard to detect from his pamphlets, consists in the resolute and dauntless courage with which this man, whose life and works had exalted the people to a point "bordering on idolatry," stood up to challenge, combat and finally conquer the masses, in whom, like Clémenceau, he could all the time scarcely distinguish the mob from the people. "Men have been found to resist the most powerful monarchs

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Clémenceau's preface to *Contre la justice*.

and to refuse to bow down before them, but few indeed have been found to resist the crowd, to stand up alone before misguided masses, to face their implacable frenzy without weapons and with folded arms to dare a no when a yes is demanded. Such a man was Zola!"<sup>94</sup>

Scarcely had *J'accuse* appeared than the Paris socialists held their first meeting and passed a resolution calling for a revision of the Dreyfus case. Yet a bare five days later some thirty-two socialist officials promptly came out with a declaration that the fate of Dreyfus, "the class enemy," was no concern of theirs. Behind this declaration stood large elements of the party in Paris. Although a split in its ranks continued throughout the affair, the party numbered enough Dreyfusards to prevent the Ligue Antisémitique from thenceforth controlling the streets. A socialist meeting even branded antisemitism as "a new form of reaction." Yet a few months later when the parliamentary elections took place, Jaurès was not returned and shortly afterwards, when Cavaignac, the minister of war, treated the Chamber to a speech attacking Dreyfus and commending the army as indispensable, the delegates resolved, with only two dissenting votes, to placard the walls of Paris with the text of that address. Similarly, when the great Paris strike broke out in October of the same year, Münster, the German ambassador, was able reliably and confidentially to inform Berlin that "as far as the broad masses are concerned, this is in no sense a political issue. The workers are simply out for higher wages and these they are bound to get in the end. As for the Dreyfus case, they have never bothered their heads about it."<sup>95</sup>

Who then, in broad terms, were the supporters of Dreyfus? Who were the 300,000 Frenchmen who so eagerly devoured Zola's *J'accuse* and who followed religiously the editorials of Clémenceau? Who were the men who finally succeeded in splitting every class, nay every family in France into opposing factions over the Dreyfus issue? The answer is that they formed no party or homogeneous group. Admittedly they were recruited more from the lower than from the upper classes as they comprised, characteristically enough, more physicians than lawyers or civil servants. By and large, however, they were a mixture of diverse elements: men as far apart as Zola and Péguy or Jaurès and Picquard, men who on the morrow would part company and go their several ways. "They come from political

<sup>94</sup> Clémenceau, in a speech before the Senate several years later; cf. Well, *op. cit.*, p. 112-13.

<sup>95</sup> See Herzog, *op. cit.*, under date of October 10, 1898.

parties and religious communities who have nothing in common, who are even in conflict with each other. . . . Those men do not know each other. They have fought and on occasion will fight again. Do not deceive yourselves; those are the 'élite' of the French democracy."<sup>98</sup>

Had Clémenceau possessed enough self-confidence at that time to consider only those who heeded him the true people of France, he would not have fallen prey to that fatal pride which marked the rest of his career. Out of his experiences during the Dreyfus affair grew his despair of the people, his contempt for men, finally his belief that he and he alone would be able to save the republic. He could never stoop to play the claque to the antics of the mob. Therefore, once he began to identify the mob with the people, he did indeed cut the ground from under his feet and forced himself into that grim aloofness which thereafter distinguished him.

The disunity of the French people was apparent in each family. Characteristically enough, it found political expression only in the ranks of the Labor party. All others, as well as all parliamentary groups, were at the beginning of the campaign for a retrial solidly against Dreyfus. All that this means, however, is that the bourgeois parties no longer represented the true feelings of the electorate, for that same disunity which was so patent in the case of the socialists in fact obtained among almost all sections of the populace. Everywhere existed a minority who took up Clémenceau's plea for justice. It was this heterogeneous minority who were the Dreyfusards. Their fight against the army and the corrupt complicity of the republic which backed it was the dominating factor in French internal politics from the end of 1897 until the opening of the exposition in 1900. It also exerted an appreciable influence on the foreign policy of the nation. Nevertheless, this entire struggle, which was to result eventually in at least a partial triumph, took place exclusively outside of Parliament. In that so-called representative assembly, comprising as it did a full 600 delegates drawn from every shade and color both of labor and of the bourgeoisie, there were in 1898 but two supporters of Dreyfus and one of them, Jaurès, was not re-elected.

The disturbing thing about the Dreyfus affair is that it was not only the mob which had to work along extra-parliamentary lines. The entire minority, fighting as it was for Parliament, democracy and the republic,

<sup>98</sup> Cf. "K.V.T.," in *The Contemporary Review* vol. lxxiv. p. 608.

was likewise constrained to wage its battle outside the Chamber. The only difference between the two elements was that while the one used the streets, the other resorted to the press and law court. In other words, the whole of the political life of France during the Dreyfus crisis was carried on outside Parliament. Nor do the several parliamentary votes in favor of the army and against a retrial in any way invalidate this conclusion. Although usually regarded as expressing a general anti-Dreyfus sentiment, it is significant to remember that when parliamentary feeling began to veer, shortly before the opening of the Paris Exposition, Minister of War Gallifet was able to declare truthfully that this in no wise represented the mood of the country.<sup>97</sup> On the other hand the vote against a retrial must not be construed as an indorsement of the coup d'état policy which the Jesuits and certain radical antisemites were trying to introduce with the help of the army.<sup>98</sup> Rather was it due to plain resistance against any change in the *status quo*. As a matter of fact, an equally overwhelming majority of the Chamber would have rejected a military-clerical dictatorship.

Those members of Parliament who had learned to regard politics as the professional representation of vested interests were naturally anxious to preserve that state of affairs upon which their "calling" and their profits depended. The Dreyfus case revealed, moreover, that the people likewise desired its representatives to look after its own special interests rather than to function as statesmen. It was distinctly unpopular to mention the case in election propaganda. Had this been due solely to antisemitism the situation of the Dreyfusards would certainly have been hopeless. In point of fact, during the elections they already enjoyed considerable support among the working class. Nevertheless even those who sided with Dreyfus did not care to see this political question dragged into the elections. It was, indeed, because he insisted on making it the pivot of his campaign that Jaurès lost his seat.

<sup>97</sup> Gallifet, minister of war, wrote to Waldeck: "Let us not forget that the great majority of people in France are antisemitic. Our position would be, therefore, that on the one side we would have the entire army and the majority of Frenchmen, not to speak of the civil service and the senators; . . ." cf. Reinach, J., *op. cit.*, vol. v, p. 579.

<sup>98</sup> The best-known of such attempts is that of Déroutède who sought, while attending the funeral of President Paul Faure, in February, 1899, to incite General Roget to mutiny. The German ambassadors and *chargés d'affaires* in Paris reported such attempts every few months. The situation is well summed up by Barrès, *op. cit.*, p. 4: "In Rennes we have found our battlefield. All we need is soldiers or, more precisely, generals—or, still more precisely, a general." Only that this general was, precisely, non-existent.

If Clémenceau and the Dreyfusards succeeded in winning over large sections of all classes to the demand for a retrial, the Catholics, convinced of their cause, remained unmoved.<sup>99</sup> What the Jesuits did in steering the aristocracy and the general staff, was done for the middle and lower classes by the Assumptionists whose organ, *La Croix*, enjoyed the largest circulation of all Catholic journals in France.<sup>100</sup> Both centered their tactics in agitation against the Jews. Both represented themselves as defenders of the army and the commonweal against the machinations of "international Jewry." More striking, however, than the attitude of the Catholics in France was the fact that the press of their Church throughout the world was solidly against Dreyfus. As the case progressed, it became increasingly clear that the agitation against the Jews in France followed an international line.<sup>101</sup> Catholic politicians were among the first to realize that latter-day power politics must be based on the interplay of colonial ambitions. They were therefore the first to link antisemitism to imperialism, declaring that the Jews were agents of England and thereby identifying antagonism towards them with Anglophobia.<sup>102</sup> The Dreyfus case, in which Jews were the central figures, thus afforded them a welcome opportunity to play their game. If England had taken Egypt from the French the Jews were to blame,<sup>103</sup> while the movement for an Anglo-American alliance was due, of course, to "Rothschild imperialism."<sup>104</sup> That the Catholic game was not confined to France became abundantly clear once the curtain was rung down on that particular scene. At the close of 1899, when Dreyfus had been pardoned and when French public opinion had veered round through fear of a projected boycott of the Exposition, it needed but an interview with Pope Leo XIII to stop the

<sup>99</sup> Cf. "K.V.T.," *loc. cit.*, p. 597: "Among them there is no divergence of opinion. . . . Whence comes this unanimity of the clericals? In the first place, it is due to the influence of the press. . . . All these journalists marched and are still marching at the word of command of their superiors."

<sup>100</sup> Brogan goes so far as to blame the Assumptionists for the entire clerical agitation.

<sup>101</sup> Thus the *Civiltà Cattolica* (February 5, 1898) declared that Jews must be excluded from the nation not only in France but also in Germany, Austria and Italy.

<sup>102</sup> "The initial stimulus in the affair came very probably from London, where the Congo-Nile mission of 1896-1898 was causing some degree of disquietude;" thus Maurras in *Action Française* (July 14, 1935). The Catholic press of London defended the Jesuits; see "The Jesuits and the Dreyfus Case," in *The Month*, vol. xviii (1899).

<sup>103</sup> *Civiltà Cattolica* (February 5, 1898).

<sup>104</sup> See the particularly characteristic article of McDermot, Rev. George, C.S.P., "Mr. Chamberlain's Foreign Policy and the Dreyfus Case," in the American monthly *Catholic World*, vol. lxvii (September 1898).

spread of antisemitism through the world.<sup>105</sup> Even in the United States, where championship of Dreyfus was particularly enthusiastic among the non-Catholics, it was possible to detect in the Catholic press after 1897 a marked resurgence of antisemitic feeling which, however, subsided overnight following the interview with Leo XIII.<sup>106</sup> The "grand strategy" of using antisemitism as an instrument of Catholicism had proved abortive.

### *The Jews and the Dreyfusards*

The case of the unfortunate Captain Dreyfus had shown the world that in every Jewish nobleman, multimillionaire and Jewish chauvinist there still remained something of the old-time pariah, who has no country, for whom human rights do not exist and whom society would gladly exclude from its privileges. There was no one, however, who found it more difficult to grasp this fact than the emancipated Jews themselves. "It isn't enough for them," wrote Bernard Lazare, "to reject any solidarity with their foreignborn brethren; they have also to go charging them with all the evils which their own cowardice engenders. They are not content with being more jingoist than the native Frenchmen; like all emancipated Jews everywhere, they have also of their own volition broken all ties of solidarity. Indeed, they go so far that for the three dozen or so men in France who are ready to defend one of their martyred brethren you can find some thousands ready to stand guard over Devil's Island, alongside the most rabid patriots of the country."<sup>107</sup> Just because they had played so small a part in the political development of the lands in which they lived they had come, during the course of the century, to make a fetish of legal equality. To them it was an article of faith. When the Dreyfus affair broke out to warn them that their security was menaced, they were deep in the process of a disintegrating assimilation, through which their lack of political wisdom was intensified rather than otherwise. They were rapidly assimilating themselves to those elements of society in which all political passions are smothered beneath the dead weight of provincial Babbitry, big business and hitherto unknown opportunities for profit. They hoped to get rid of the antipathy which this tendency had called forth by diverting it against their poor and as

<sup>105</sup> Cf. Lecanuet, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. Halperin, Rose A., *op. cit.*, p. 59, 77 ff.

<sup>107</sup> In *L'Echo Sioniste* (April 20, 1901).

yet unassimilated immigrant brethren. Using the same tactics as gentile society had employed against them they took pains to dissociate themselves from the so-called *Ostjuden*. Political antisemitism, such as had manifested itself in the pogroms of Russia and Rumania, they dismissed airily as a survival from the Middle Ages, scarcely a reality of modern politics. They could never understand that more was at stake in the Dreyfus affair than mere social status, if only because more than mere social antisemitism had been brought to bear.

These then are the reasons why so few wholehearted supporters of Dreyfus were to be found in the ranks of French Jewry.<sup>108</sup> The Jews, including the very family of the accused, shrank from starting a political fight. On just these grounds, Labori, counsel for Zola, was refused the defense before the Rennes tribunal, while Dreyfus' second lawyer, Démange, was constrained to base his plea on the issue of doubt. It was hoped thereby to smother under a deluge of compliments any possible attack from the army or its officers. The idea was that the royal road to an acquittal was to pretend that the whole thing boiled down to the possibility of a judicial error, the victim of which just happened by chance to be a Jew. The result was a second verdict and Dreyfus, refusing to face the true issue, was induced to renounce a retrial and instead to petition for clemency.<sup>109</sup> The Jews failed to see that what was involved was an organized fight against them on an ideological front. They therefore resisted the co-operation of men who were prepared to meet the challenge on this basis. How blind was their attitude is shown clearly by the case of Clémenceau. Clémenceau's struggle for justice as the foundation of the state certainly embraced the restoration of equal rights to the Jews. In an age, however, of class struggle on the one hand and rampant jingoism on the other, it would have remained without political actuality had it not been conceived, at the same time, in terms of the oppressed fighting their oppressors. Clémenceau was one of the few true friends modern Jewry has known just because he recognized and proclaimed before the

<sup>108</sup> See Clémenceau's articles entitled "Le Spectacle du jour," "Et les Juifs!" "La Farce du syndicat," and "Encore les juifs!" in *L'Iniquité*.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. Labori, Fernand, "Le mal politique et les partis," in *La Grande Revue* (October-December, 1901): "From the moment at Rennes when the accused pleaded guilty and the defendant renounced recourse to a retrial in the hope of gaining a pardon, the Dreyfus case as a great, universal human issue was definitely closed." In his article entitled "Le Spectacle du jour," Clémenceau speaks of the Jews of Algiers "in whose behalf Rothschild will not voice the least protest."



world that Jews were one of the oppressed peoples of Europe. The anti-semite tends to see in the Jewish parvenu an upstart pariah; consequently in every huckster he fears a Rothschild and in every *shnorrer* a parvenu. But Clémenceau, in his consuming passion for justice, still conceived the Rothschilds as members of a downtrodden people. His anguish over the national misfortune of France opened his eyes and his heart even to those "unfortunates, who pose as leaders of their people and promptly leave them in the lurch," to those cowed and subdued elements who, in their ignorance, weakness and fear, have been so much bedazzled by admiration of the stronger as to exclude them from partnership in any active struggle and who are able only when the battle has been won to "rush to the aid of the winner."<sup>110</sup>

### *The Pardon and Its Significance*

That the Dreyfus drama was no tragedy but a comedy became apparent only in its final act. The *deus ex machina* who united the disrupted country, turned Parliament in favor of a retrial and eventually reconciled the disparate elements of the people, from the extreme right to the socialists, was nothing other than the Paris Exposition of 1900. What Clémenceau's daily editorials, Zola's pathos, Jaurès' speeches and the popular hate of clergy and aristocracy had failed to achieve, namely, a change of parliamentary feeling in favor of Dreyfus, was at last accomplished by the fear of a boycott. The same Parliament which a year before had unanimously rejected a retrial, now by a two-thirds majority passed a vote of censure on an anti-Dreyfus government. In July, 1899 the Waldeck-Rousseau cabinet came to power. President Loubet pardoned Dreyfus and liquidated the entire affair. The Exposition was able to open under the brightest of commercial skies and general fraternization ensued: even socialists became eligible for government posts; Millerand, the first socialist minister in Europe, received the portfolio of commerce.

Parliament became the champion of Dreyfus! That was the upshot. For Clémenceau, of course, it was a defeat. To the bitter end he denounced the ambiguous pardon and the even more ambiguous amnesty. "All it has done," said Zola,<sup>111</sup> "is to lump together in a single stinking pardon men of honor and hoodlums. All have been thrown into one pot."

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, "Encore les juifs!" and "La Farce du syndicat."

<sup>111</sup> Cf. Zola's letter dated September 13, 1899, in *Correspondance: lettres à Maître Labori*.

Clémenceau remained, as at the beginning, utterly alone. The socialists, above all, Jaurès, welcomed both pardon and amnesty. Did it not insure them a place in the government and a more extensive representation of their special interests? A few months later, in May, 1900, when the success of the Exposition was assured the real truth at last emerged. All of these appeasement tactics were to be at the expense of the Dreyfusards. The motion for a further retrial was defeated by 425 votes to 60.<sup>112</sup> But the defeat for Clémenceau did not mean victory for the Church and the army. The separation of Church and State and the ban on parochial education brought to an end the political influence of Catholicism in France. Similarly, the subjection of the intelligence service to the ministry of war, *i.e.*, to the civil authority, robbed the army of its blackmailing influence on cabinet and Chamber and removed from it any justification for conducting police inquiries on its own account.

In 1909 Drumont stood for the Academy. Once his antisemitism had been lauded by the Catholics and acclaimed by the people. Now, however, the "greatest historian since Fustel"<sup>113</sup> was obliged to yield to Marcel Prévost, author of the somewhat pornographic *Demi-Vièrges*, and the new "immortal" received the congratulations of the Jesuit Father Du Lac.<sup>114</sup> Even the Society of Jesus had composed its quarrel with the Third Republic. The close of the Dreyfus case marked the end of clerical antisemitism.<sup>115</sup> The compromise adopted by the Third Republic cleared the defendant without granting him a regular trial, while it restricted the activities of Catholic organizations. Whereas Bernard Lazare had asked equal rights for both sides the state had allowed one exception for the Jews and another which threatened the freedom of conscience of Catholics.<sup>116</sup> The parties which were really in conflict were

<sup>112</sup> Even Clémenceau's government in 1906 did not dare to entrust the retrial to a normal court of law. The (illegal) acquittal through the Court of Appeal was a compromise.

<sup>113</sup> Lemaître's estimate of Drumont as quoted by Schapira, J., *Der Antisemitismus in der französischen Literatur* (Berlin 1927) p. 132.

<sup>114</sup> Cf. Herzog, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

<sup>115</sup> Only the Jesuits seem to have forgotten nothing and learned nothing. Thus long before the fascist coup in Italy their journal, *Civiltà Cattolica*, was carrying anti-Jewish propaganda and its policy was not affected by the anti-Christian attitude of the Nazis; see the passage cited from the issue of April, 1938 by Starr, Joshua, "Italy's Antisemites," in *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. i (1939) 109 f. Among the exceptions to the foregoing statement the most notable is the Jesuit Pierre Charles of Louvain, who has denounced the *Protocols*.

<sup>116</sup> Lazare's position in the Dreyfus affair is best described by Péguy in *Notre Jeunesse* (Paris 1934). Regarding him as the true representative of Jewish interests Péguy formulates

both placed outside the law, with the result that the Jewish question on the one hand and political Catholicism on the other were banished thenceforth from the arena of practical politics. Had this been the upshot of the whole tragi-comedy it would have been a sorry thing for Jewish history. In point of fact, however, the Dreyfus affair was of marked positive significance: it kindled the flame of political Zionism.

### *Herzl and Lazare*

To the mass of Western Jewry, never really assimilated despite the recourse of some to the antisemitic salons, the Dreyfus case was scarcely of decisive consequence. But to the "modern, cultured Jew who had outgrown the ghetto and its haggling it was a thrust to the heart."<sup>117</sup> For him Herzl's naive generalization was true: it had taken "the common enemy" to make him once more member of a people.<sup>118</sup> These "prodigal sons" had learned a lot from their environment and when they returned to the ancestral hearth they found themselves possessed by that intense discontent which has always been the hallmark of true patriotism and of true devotion to one's people. Sadly and with a certain amazement they came to realize that the moment they proposed improvements in the age-old structure, it was at once decided to expel them from it. And all the time they saw the building in danger of collapse.

Theodor Herzl arrived in Paris just in time to report the first Dreyfus trial for a Vienna paper. He heard the rabble cry "Death to the Jews!" and proceeded to write *The Jewish State*. Bernard Lazare had come from his home town in the south of France some years before, in the midst of the antisemitic furore caused by the Panama scandal. Shortly before the Dreyfus case he had published a two-volume work on antisemitism, in which he had laid it down that this was due, among other things, to the unsocial behavior of the Jews.<sup>119</sup> At that time he believed that he had found in socialism the solution. Lazare likewise was an eyewitness of the

Lazare's demands as follows (p. 110): "Common right for Dreyfus, common right against the congregations. It looks like nothing but it can lead far. It led Lazare to a death in isolation. He stood essentially for justice . . . against exceptions." Lazare was one of the first Dreyfusards to protest against the law governing congregations; *ibid.*, p. 102 ff.

<sup>117</sup> Herzl, Theodor, *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. i, p. 176.

<sup>118</sup> Cf. Herzl's statement before the British Aliens Commission: "A nation is an historic group of men united by clearly discernible ties, and held together by a common foe." (*Gesammelte Werke*, vol. i, p. 474).

<sup>119</sup> Lazare, Bernard, *L'Antisémitisme: son histoire et ses causes* (Paris 1894).

Dreyfus trial and he determined not to wait for the world revolution. As he came face to face with the rising hatred of the mob he realized at once that from now on he was an outcast<sup>120</sup> and accepted the challenge. Alone among the champions of Dreyfus he took his place as a conscious Jew, fighting for justice in general but for the Jewish people in particular.<sup>121</sup>

Both men were turned into Jews by antisemitism. Neither concealed the fact.<sup>122</sup> Both realized just because they were so "assimilated" that emancipation had remained a dead letter, and that in reality the Jew had become the pariah of the modern world.<sup>123</sup> Both stood outside the religious tradition of Judaism and neither wished to return to it. Both were removed, as intellectuals, from those narrow and parochial Jewish cliques which had somehow grown up within the framework of gentile society. Both were poles apart from that social ghetto which had retained everything of the ghetto's life except its inner values. Yet both were its natural products; it was from this that both had escaped. When they were drawn back Judaism could no longer mean to them a religion, and certainly not the half-hearted adherence to one of many cliques. For them their Jewish origin had a political and national significance. They could find no place for themselves in Jewry unless the Jewish people became a nation. In their subsequent fight for the liberation of their people both men came into serious conflict with the forces which then controlled

<sup>120</sup> Cf. Lazare, *Le Fumier de Iob* (Paris 1928) p. 64: "Henceforth I am a pariah."

<sup>121</sup> Cf. Péguy, *Notre Jeunesse*, p. 68-69, 74: "The politicians, the rabbis, the official communities of Israel . . . were only too willing to sacrifice Dreyfus for the sake of an illusion. The great mass of the Jews . . . has never been led to its great, if sad, destiny except by force—that is, by a band of fanatics grouped around certain heads, or more precisely, around the prophets of Israel. In this great crisis for Israel and the world the prophet was Bernard Lazare."

<sup>122</sup> Cf. Herzl's remark in a letter of the year 1895: "My Judaism was to me a matter of indifference. . . . However, just as antisemitism sent the feeble, cowardly and ambitious Jews into the ranks of Christendom, so it sent me back with renewed vigor to my Judaism." (*Tagebücher*, vol. i, p. 120-121) Similar statements occur *passim* in his diaries. Bernard Lazare's declaration may be found in his *Fumier de Iob*: "I am a Jew, yet I ignore everything Jewish. . . . I must needs know who I am, why I am hated and what I might be."

<sup>123</sup> Cf. the remark of Herzl at the "family council" of the Rothschilds: "Sie werden nirgends als voll, ja nicht einmal als Staatsangehörige angesehen;" *Tagebücher*, vol. i, p. 187. Similarly in the memoranda for his interview with Baron Hirsch there occurs the observation: "You are pariahs. You have to live on tenterhooks lest anyone deprive you of your rights or property." (*Gesammelte Werke*, vol. vi, p. 462) Cf. also Lazare's remark about the "unconscious pariah," i.e., the non-emancipated Jew and the "conscious pariah" of western society, in *Le Nationalisme Juif* (Paris 1898) p. 8; *Kadimah*, no. 1.

Jewish politics, namely, the philanthropists. In these conflicts, which in the end exhausted them, both were to learn that the Jewish people was threatened not only by the antisemites from without but also by the rule of its "benefactors" from within.<sup>124</sup>

But here the similarity ends and there begins that great difference which was to lead ultimately to a personal breach between the two men, when they were serving together on the executive committee of the Zionist Organization. Herzl's solution of the Jewish problem was, in the final analysis, escape or deliverance in a homeland. In the light of the Dreyfus case the whole of the gentile world seemed to him hostile; there were only Jews and antisemites.<sup>125</sup> He considered that he would have to deal with this hostile world and even with avowed antisemites. To him it was a matter of indifference just how hostile a gentile might be; indeed, thought he, the more antisemitic a man was the more he would appreciate the advantages of a Jewish exodus from Europe!<sup>126</sup> To Lazare, on the other hand, the territorial question was secondary—a mere outcome of the primary demand that "the Jews should be emancipated as a people and in the form of a nation."<sup>127</sup> What he sought was not an escape from antisemitism but a mobilization of the people against its foes. This is shown clearly by his part in the Dreyfus case and by his later memorandum on the persecution of the Jews in Rumania.<sup>128</sup> The consequence of this attitude was that he did not look around for more or less antisemitic pro-

<sup>124</sup> In his interview with Lord Rothschild Herzl described Jewish charity as "eine Maschine zur Unterdrückung der Notschreie." (*Tagebücher*, vol. iii, p. 218.) He came into open conflict with the philanthropists when he established the Jewish Colonial Bank and the latter subsequently foundered, as the result of being boycotted by Jewish financial circles. The matter is discussed at length in his *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. i, p. 406 ff., and there are frequent references to it in the diaries. Similarly Lazare came into conflict with the whole of French Jewry through his championship of Dreyfus. Cf. Hagani, Baruch, *Bernard Lazare, 1865-1903* (Paris 1919) p. 28 ff. That he got the worst of this conflict is shown fully by Péguy, *op. cit.*, p. 75 ff. One example quoted by Péguy (p. 84) is significant: "When negotiations were started for founding a large-scale daily, the Jewish backers hardly imposed any condition other than that Bernard Lazare should not write for it."

<sup>125</sup> Cf. his remark in *Der Judenstaat* (*Gesammelte Werke*, vol. i, p. 36): "The peoples among whom Jews live are one and all shamefully or shamelessly antisemitic."

<sup>126</sup> Cf. the recurrent observation recorded in his *Tagebücher*, vol. i, p. 93: "It is the antisemites who will be our staunchest friends, and the antisemitic countries which will be our allies." How he interpreted this notion in practice is revealed in a letter to Katznelson, written in connection with the Kishinev pogroms of 1903. In that letter he seeks to "derive some measure of advantage from the threatening calamity."

<sup>127</sup> In *Le Fumier de Iob*.

<sup>128</sup> *Les Juifs en Roumanie* (Paris 1902).

tectors but for real comrades-in-arms, whom he hoped to find among all the oppressed groups of contemporary Europe.<sup>129</sup> He knew that anti-semitism was neither an isolated nor a universal phenomenon and that the shameful complicity of the Powers in the East-European pogroms had been symptomatic of something far deeper, namely, the threatened collapse of all moral values under the pressure of imperialist politics.<sup>130</sup>

In the light of the Dreyfus case and of his own experience in fighting alongside of Jews for one of their brethren Lazare came to realize that the real obstacle in the path of his people's emancipation was not anti-semitism. It was "the demoralization of a people made up of the poor and downtrodden, who live on the alms of their wealthy brethren, a people revolted only by persecution from without but not by oppression from within, revolutionaries in the society of others but not in their own."<sup>131</sup> Ill would it serve the cause of freedom, thought he, if a man were to begin by abandoning his own people. Fighters for freedom could be internationalists only if by that they meant that they were prepared to recognize the freedom of all nations; anti-national they could never be.<sup>132</sup> Lazare's criticism of his people was at least as bitter as Herzl's but he never despised them and did not share Herzl's idea that politics must be conducted from above.<sup>133</sup> Faced with the alternative of remaining politically

<sup>129</sup> Characteristic of this attitude is the following passage from his *Juifs en Roumanie*, p. 103: "It may well be that if it [the Rumanian bourgeoisie] plunges the Jew into despair and pushes him to the limit, this very fact, despite his passivity and despite the advice of his wealthy faint-hearts, will forge a link between him and the agricultural laborer and aid both to throw off the yoke." In marked contrast is the attitude of Herzl, as revealed when, following his interview with the sultan, he received telegrams of protest from student-meetings comprising persons of all kinds of oppressed nationalities. He was, he confessed, "pained and distressed," but the only political effect this had on him was to make him talk about using those telegrams in his conversations with the sultan! Cf. *Tagebücher*, vol. iii, p. 103.

<sup>130</sup> Cf. his remark in *Les Juifs en Roumanie*, p. 91: "Besides, what other nation dares open its mouth? England, who wiped out the Boers? Russia, who oppressed the Finns and Jews? France, who massacred the Annamites . . . and is now getting ready to butcher the Moors? Italy, who ravages in Eritrea today and in Tripoli tomorrow? Or Germany, the savage executioner of the negroes?"

An interesting insight into the connection between antisemitism's brutalization of peoples and the policies of imperialism is revealed by Fernand Labori, would-be counsel for Dreyfus, in his article "Le Mal politique et les partis," in *La Grande Revue* (October-December, 1901) 276: "Similarly, the movement of colonial expansion provides . . . a characteristic trait of the present era. It is a commonplace to point out that this policy has cost humanity moral as well as material sacrifices."

<sup>131</sup> *Le Fumier de Iob*, p. 151.

<sup>132</sup> Péguy, *Notre Jeunesse*, p. 130, stresses this contrast between the international and the anti-national as illustrating Lazare's Jewish patriotism.

<sup>133</sup> Cf. *Tagebücher*, vol. i, p. 193.

ineffective or of including himself among the élite group of saviors, he preferred to retreat into absolute isolation where, if he could do naught else, he could at least remain one of the people.<sup>134</sup>

For Lazare could find no supporters in France. The only element of Western Europe which might have responded to his message, the Jews who had outgrown the petty trader's haggling, the intellectuals in the liberal professions, were virtually non-existent in that country. On the other hand, the impoverished masses, whom he had loved so deeply, and the Jewish oppressed, whom he had championed so devotedly,<sup>135</sup> were separated from him by thousands of miles as well as by a difference in language. In a certain sense, therefore, Herzl with the support of German and Austrian Jewry succeeded where Lazare failed. So utter, indeed, was his failure that he was passed over in silence by his Jewish contemporaries<sup>136</sup> to be recovered to us by Catholic writers; better than we those men knew that Lazare was a great Jewish patriot as well as a great French writer.<sup>137</sup>

<sup>134</sup> On March 24, 1899 Lazare wrote to Herzl that he felt obliged to resign from the executive committee, which, he added, "tries to direct the Jewish masses as if they were an ignorant child. . . . That is a conception radically opposed to all my political and social opinions and I can therefore not assume responsibility for it;" quoted by Hagani, *Bernard Lazare*, p. 39.

<sup>135</sup> Péguy, *Notre Jeunesse*, p. 87, describes him as follows: "A heart which beat to all the echoes of the world, a man who could skim four, six, eight or a dozen pages of a newspaper to light, like a streak of lightning, on a single line containing the word Jew . . . a heart which bled in all the ghettos of the world . . . wherever the Jew was oppressed, that is, in a sense, everywhere."

<sup>136</sup> *ibid.*, p. 84: "Everything was set in motion to make him die quietly of hunger."

<sup>137</sup> If it were not for Péguy's memoir, "Le portrait de Bernard Lazare," prefixed to the posthumous edition of *Le Fumier de Iob*, we would know little about Lazare. Hagani's biography is based to a large extent on Péguy, while it was only with the latter's help that Lazare himself was able to publish his work on the Jews of Rumania. The saddest part of this sad story is the fact, pointed out by Péguy, that the only man who really appreciated Lazare's greatness and love for Jewry, even though he regarded him as an enemy, was Edouard Drumont.

## ANTISEMITISM IN MODERN GERMANY

By WALDEMAR GURLAN\*

Martin Luther, disappointed by his failure to convert the Jews, became one of their bitterest enemies. In his pamphlet of 1543 *On The Jews and Their Lies* he wrote: "There is no people under the sun so avid of revenge, so bloodthirsty, believing itself to be God's people merely in order to strangle and immolate the heathens. . . . Know, Christian, that next to the devil thou hast no enemy more cruel, more venomous and violent than a true Jew."<sup>1</sup> Luther's "unusually harsh language," which "displeased even some of his followers,"<sup>2</sup> seems to anticipate and to justify the attempts of the National Socialists to exterminate the Jews. It is no matter of chance that Luther's antisemitic utterances were reprinted in Germany after Hitler's rise to power. Yet if Luther at times appeared to deny the Jew even the right to live, or to regard him as a parasite and exploiter by virtue of his unchangeably evil nature, he attacked the Jews essentially because they were not and refused to become Christians. He concluded his *Exhortation against the Jews* of February 15, 1546 with a significant statement: "If the Jews wish to be converted and give up blaspheming and everything else they have been doing to us, we shall readily pardon them. If not, we shall not bear and tolerate them amongst us."

Modern antisemitism, which culminated and became a most gruesome reality in the extermination camps of Hitler's Third Reich, started to develop only after the secularization of life, which transformed religious beliefs into private affairs without public significance. Only then could racial intolerance replace the religious intolerance which dominated the conscious attitude of Luther and of other medieval minds toward the Jew. Only then could the attempt be made, first in theory and with some limitations in practice, finally with the utmost ruthlessness, to define and handle the Jew as being necessarily evil by nature with no chance or possibility of change and redemption.

\* The author is indebted to his colleague, Prof. M. A. Fitzsimmons, for his untiring help, without which this article could not have been completed.

<sup>1</sup> Translation of Luther's statements as quoted by Baron, S. W., *A Social and Religious History of the Jews* (New York 1937) vol. ii, p. 124.

<sup>2</sup> Baron, *op. cit.*



This study attempts to give a survey of the rise and the types of modern antisemitism in Germany. Modern antisemitism is not an exclusively German affair—even German racist theories have some non-German ancestors, most prominent and unwittingly among them is Ernest Renan—but it has found its most radical formulations and applications in Germany. My analysis will deal with the various ideological trends and, finally, with the changes in the politico-social structure that, first, brought about the identification of antisemitism and Hitler's totalitarian nationalism, and, secondly, helped National Socialism to seize power.

The description of modern antisemitism in Germany offered here begins with Eisenmenger's *Entdecktes Judenthum*, a work which has been characterized as the "last compendium of medieval Jew-hatred."<sup>3</sup> Thus it may serve as a useful point of departure for a study of the modern phases.

### *From Eisenmenger to Duehring*

Eisenmenger's *Entdecktes Judenthum*, published after some trouble under Prussian privileges in 1711,<sup>4</sup> has exercised a tremendous influence upon all haters and enemies of the Jews. Indeed, it has remained a source-book for antisemites even to our own day.<sup>5</sup> But it is not representative of modern racial antisemitism, for Eisenmenger believed—or tried to give the impression that he believed—that his opposition to the Jews was religious in origin. In his concluding chapters he discussed the various facts that favored or prevented the renunciation of the Jewish religion. To Eisenmenger the Jew was a dangerous alien, separated from all other peoples, hating and exploiting them, because he accepted the Talmud with its—according to Eisenmenger—anti-human legislation and views. This dangerous Talmudic Jew despised the Christianized Jews and threatened to kill them. Eisenmenger blamed the Christians as well for their failure to support these victims of Jewish hatred.

<sup>3</sup> Arendt, Hannah, "Privileged Jews," in *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. viii (1946) 3-31.

<sup>4</sup> Eisenmenger, Johann A., *Entdecktes Judenthum. Mit Preussischem Privileg* (Koenigsberg 1711). This edition had been printed in Berlin, after a first edition had been confiscated by order of Emperor Leopold I, who had been influenced by Jews. For the details cf. *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, art. "Eisenmenger." An English adaptation by J. P. Stehelin entitled *The Tradition of the Jews* appeared in London, 1732-1734. Excerpts were published by J. Eckes in Stuttgart, 1924.

<sup>5</sup> Dubnow, S., *Weltgeschichte des juedischen Volkes* (Berlin 1929) vol. x, p. 77, mentions that August Röhlings's *Der Talmudjude* (1875) was characterized by opponents as "ein Plagiat an dem *Entdeckten Judentum* von Eisenmenger."

The Jew was defined by his religion, which formed the basis of Jewish national existence, and his religion was pictured as anti-social and anti-human. Thus in order to claim equal rights for him and to regard the Jew as a citizen like other citizens, it was necessary to show that his religion did not separate the Jew from humanity. Moses Mendelssohn endeavored to prove, e.g., in his *Jerusalem*,<sup>6</sup> that the Jewish religion was nothing else than the natural religion common to all mankind, and that the social and political roles of Jewish legislation had ended with the destruction of the Temple. The Jew was a man like other men, and he could remain an adherent of his traditional Judaism without separating himself from society and mankind. He was under obligation to observe the laws of the country in which he was living, and his observance of the Mosaic law was a private affair without social importance. On an intellectual basis similar to that of Mendelssohn and also of Lessing's *Nathan the Wise* (1779), the Prussian civil servant, Ch. W. von Dohm, developed the practical program of Jewish emancipation.<sup>7</sup> Dohm exercised a decisive influence upon the practical attitude toward the Jew. According to him Jews could be made a truly useful part of the population. He urged the reversal of the policy of segregation and of restriction to certain professions which created a specific mentality. The so-called bad qualities of the Jews were the products of gentile behavior toward them. Dohm, who was a child of the eighteenth century with its enlightened despots, would have been tremendously surprised by the recent claim of antisemites<sup>8</sup> that at his time the Jews enjoyed liberties

<sup>6</sup> Mendelssohn, Moses, *Jerusalem oder ueber religioese Macht und Judentum* (Berlin 1783). The advice is given to the Jews (p. 127): "Schickt euch in die Sitten und in die Verfassung des Landes in welches ihr versetzt seid; aber haltet euch standhaft bey der Religion eurer Vaeter." The observance of the ceremonial law by the Jews should not conflict with the civic love ("buergerliche Liebe") of the Christians.

<sup>7</sup> The book of the Prussian archivist and military councillor, Christian W. von Dohm, *Ueber die buergerliche Verbesserung der Juden*, appeared in Berlin-Stettin, 1781.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Botzenhart, Erich, "Politischer Aufstieg des Judentums bis zur Revolution von 1848," in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, vol. iii (1938): "Die angebliche Unterdrueckung des Judentums im absoluten Staat dieser Zeit bedeutet gar nichts anderes als seine Einordnung in das Feste Gefuege einer korporativ straff gegliederten staatlichen und wirtschaftlichen Organisation . . . Dem Judentum war in dieser Organisation sein geschichtlich gewordener Platz genau wie allen anderen zugewiesen . . . Dabei war die Stellung des Judentums innerhalb dieser Ordnung eine sehr viel guenstigere als die mancher anderen Staende." Cf. the interesting discussion by Hannah Arendt (*loc. cit.*) of the different conditions under which the few *Hoffjuden* and the mass of the Jews lived: "Jews with a lot of money and great ability were able to enter the paradise of rights and liberties, and Jews without money and business still continued to live in dire poverty and without civic rights."

and were simply regarded as belonging to a status with particular rights and obligations in a corporate society organized according to status. He believed that to open all professions to Jews, to grant them full citizenship rights would cause all peculiarities to disappear, perhaps not at once, but after generations; he was opposed to immediate admission of Jews into the civil service and he agreed that in the beginning it would be necessary to prevent concentration in their traditional trades.<sup>9</sup> Before the French Revolution Dohm developed the fundamental program of the Emancipation,<sup>10</sup> based, it is true, on the ideal of enlightened absolutism, according to which the state has to care from above for the welfare and increase of the population. The Jews are men like other men; they are not responsible if they have some peculiar features—these features were imposed upon them; they will become completely “assimilated”—to use the expression which later became so popular—if their disabilities are removed.

A belief similar to that of Dohm's but less radical, dominated the attempts of the Austrian Emperor, Joseph,<sup>11</sup> to change the laws applying to the Jewish group, and to educate the Jews towards participation in the general life of the national community. This program involved acceptance of German family-names and the use of the German language in business. Although this legislation did not abolish the special status of

<sup>9</sup> Dohm, *op. cit.*, p. 118 f.: The Jews should not yet be admitted into the civil service “in den naechsten Generationen . . . Der noch zu kaufmaennische Geist der meisten Juden wird besser durch starke koerperliche Arbeiten als durch die stillsitzende des oeffentlichen Bedienten gebrochen werden.”

<sup>10</sup> On the fundamental change brought about by the Emancipation, cf. Baron: “Before the French Revolution Jewry was organized in special corporate bodies endowed with a legal status of their own . . . the modern egalitarian state could no longer tolerate the existence of such a self-governing body. Emancipation is an exchange of the duties of citizenship for the right of an extensive self-government.” Baron, S. W., “The Jewish Question in the Nineteenth Century,” *Journal of Modern History*, vol. x (1938) 59.

Cf. R. Mahler, *Jewish Emancipation. A Selection of Documents*. Pamphlet Series, Jews and the Post-War World, no. 1 (New York 1941).

<sup>11</sup> The Edict of Toleration of January 2, 1782 is reprinted in Mahler, *ibid.*, p. 17f. Wilhelm Bauer wrote in his article, “Zur Judenfrage als gesamtdeutscher Angelegenheit,” in *Festgabe fuer Heinrich Ritter von Srbik* . . . (Munich 1938) p. 238: “Ohne Vorbehalt fuer die Segnungen der Toleranz war nur jene duenne Schicht reicher und satter Juden die . . . durch jene zwei Patente im grossen und ganzen bloss die rechtliche Bekraefftigung dessen erhielten was sie schon praktisch innehatten. Die Mehrzahl der anderen Juden haette mit Freuden auf Freiheiten verzichtet, die ihr bisheriges nationales und religioeses Eigenleben zu zerst hoeren drohten.” And W. Bauer, who did not like the emancipation, accused Emperor Joseph II of being responsible—unconsciously—for the permeation of occidental civilization with the Jewish spirit!

the Jews, it was motivated by a belief in the idea of universal citizenship and equality before the law.

Legal emancipation began in the German states only after the French Revolution.<sup>12</sup> It was first introduced in these states under French influence and domination. In Prussia it was one of the reforms carried out by Hardenberg, after the defeat of 1806 had made a break with the Prussian regime of the eighteenth century unavoidable. Emancipation was legally completed with some reverses (especially after the Congress of Vienna) in all Germany only in 1871, when the constitution of the Reich took over the provisions of the North Germanic Confederation.

But we observe that even before the emancipation there developed a strong opposition to the attempts of the Jews to overcome their separation from society and national life. Fichte, in 1793, characterized the Jews as citizens of a secret super-state spread among and inimical to all nations.<sup>13</sup> This claim was eagerly repeated by Grattenauer, a writer of antisemitic pamphlets, who, by his *Wider die Juden* (1803)<sup>14</sup> won a sensational success in Berlin with his denunciations of Jewish salons and social influence, which had developed in the last decades of the eighteenth century, before the legal emancipation.<sup>15</sup> The Jews were accused of

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Mahler, *op. cit.* Botzenhart, *loc. cit.*, claims that the Jewish legislation of the South German States was influenced by Joseph II's Edict of Toleration. But the Prussian Edict on the Civil Status of the Jews in the Prussian state of March 11, 1812—like the earlier Jewish laws of Frankfurt (1810) and the Mecklenburg law of February 22, 1812—drops all "caution." (p. 72) National Socialist writers attack, besides Hardenberg, particularly W. von Humboldt for his work in behalf of Jewish emancipation. W. Grau's *W. von Humboldt und die Juden* (Hamburg 1936) tries to show that purely private motives—particularly his love for the beautiful mistress of a Jewish Berlin society salon, Madame Herz—caused his unfortunate philosemitic inclinations. Grau misrepresents the relations between von Humboldt and Mrs. Herz, and he overlooks the humanitarian-enlightened basis of von Humboldt's interest in the emancipation. Humboldt, though he had many personal friends among Jews, said: "I love the Jew really only *en masse*; *en détail* I strictly avoid him." Cf. Arendt, *loc. cit.*

<sup>13</sup> This characterization became a particularly popular quotation among antisemites and is to be found in J. G. Fichte's *Beiträge zur Berichtigung der Urtheile ueber die franzoesische Revolution*.

<sup>14</sup> W. F. Grattenauer believed that Jewish odor had bad effects on the health of non Jews (p. 12 of the 4th ed. of *Wider die Juden*) and he denied the possibility of changing the dangerous destructive spirit of Jewry. (p. 152)

<sup>15</sup> Hartshorne, R., *The Nature of Geography* (Lancaster 1939) p. 64, notes "In his youth, A. v. Humboldt had first found intellectual stimulus in what seemed to Goethe, Forster, and many others as 'the barren environment of Berlin' almost exclusively in a small circle of Jewish intellectuals. From them he had learned of Lessing and Kant." For the attitude of intellectuals of the eighteenth century to regard Jews as exemplary models of humanity, just because they belonged to a despised, oppressed and alien people, (Herder was the most outstanding representative of such views)—cf. Hannah Arendt, *loc. cit.*

being allies of corrupt Prussian aristocrats (Buchholz) and of being responsible for the victory of anti-traditional and dissolvent forces (von Marwitz). A Prussian nationalistic club, the Christian German Tafelrunde, did not accept Jews, even though the members had Jewish friends, continued to frequent Jewish salons and apparently did not—at least in personal relations—look upon baptized Jews as Jews.<sup>16</sup>

The discussion about the Jews assumed a new violence during and after the Congress of Vienna.<sup>17</sup> In addition to the opposition to emancipation manifested by the German states, particularly such cities as Frankfurt, Hamburg and Luebeck, there began a literary campaign which expressed a new kind of hostility. Ruehs published in the *Zeitschrift für neueste Geschichte der Völker und Staatenkunde* (February 1815) an article about the claims of the Jews to German citizenship, in which he professed that he had formerly been an adherent of pro-Jewish humanitarian ideas. He still advocated "human rights" for Jews, but the Enlightenment went too far: its representative Dohm explained all Jewish peculiarities as arising from external pressures, which according to Ruehs, is not correct. The Jews are not only a people but subjects of a "theocracy." They form a state of their own and as inhabitants of a gentile state they suffer from a conflict of loyalties. Thus they can only be subjects, not citizens—a distinction which, by the way, came to be applied in Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, the Nazi program and the Nuremberg laws. Jews accept the rule of rabbis, regard themselves as the chosen people, and think of labor as punishment. Thus, they can, accordingly, only be tolerated; their rights must be limited; they should not be allowed positions of authority, that is, they should not be appointed as judges and officials or teachers; they are to bear a special sign; their immigration ought to be prevented, etc. On the other hand, work for the christianization of Jews is recommended, a proof that Ruehs was not a conscious racist.

While Ruehs' opposition to the emancipation of the Jews expressed

<sup>16</sup> Krueger, Hans Karl, *Berliner Romantik und Berliner Judentum* (Bonn 1939) made desperate efforts to explain away the friendly relations of the Berlin romantic authors with Jews: "In E. T. A. Hoffmann zeigt sich der sonderbare Zwiespalt des romantischen Menschen. Er greift nach der Hilfe einzelner Juden, aber er wendet sich gegen das Judentum als solches." Kleist also needed Jewish society: "Im leidvollen Erfahren seiner Einsamkeit sucht Kleist die belebende Waerme des juedischen Salons." (1)

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Baron, S., *Die Judenfrage auf dem Wiener Kongress* (1920).

the attitude of conservative believers in a Christian state, it is not as interesting as J. Fries' radical rejection of Judaism, advanced in a review of Ruehs' pamphlet. This rejection deserves particular attention, because it is based upon an acceptance of a secularized humanitarian belief, with explicit abandonment of Ruehs' belief in a Christian state and a Christian community. In his pamphlet *Ueber die Gefaehrung des Wohlstandes und Characters der Deutschen durch die Juden* (Heidelberg 1816) Fries accepted Ruehs' criticism of Dohm's belief that the Jewish character was corrupted by pressure from outside. He agreed with Ruehs "that the evil character of Jewish life is based upon the religious and civil constitution of Jewry." (p. 6) But unlike Ruehs he did not propose that in a Christian community the Jews be tolerated as a group with restricted minority rights. Judaism must be completely wiped out. He was not against the Jews, "our brothers," he claimed, "but against Jewry" (*Judenschaft*). This pestilence must be completely removed. "To improve the civil position of the Jews means to wipe out Jewry, to destroy the society of mendacious hucksters and merchants." (p. 10) The Jews, according to Fries, should not be permitted to form Jewish groups. Such Jewish groups are necessarily anti-human, based upon an anti-social theocracy, apart from and opposed to mankind. The Jews must disappear as a group. If they were to remain a group, they would be unable to fulfill the duties of a citizen of a national state. On the other hand, Fries is no racist. The state must give "to everybody, Wend, German or Jew, the same rights, the same protection," but Jewry cannot be tolerated, except possibly in some cities and under the strictest supervision.<sup>18</sup>

Ruehs revived a traditional opposition to Jewish equality—the Jew cannot have equal rights in a Christian nation—and represented the views of conservative opponents of emancipation or, at least, of a complete emancipation which would permit Jews to occupy positions of authority. Such views were repeated and later systematically formulated by the famous theoretician of Prussian conservatism and of the Christian state,

<sup>18</sup> Cf. also Wilhelm Bauer's analysis of Ludwig Holst *Judenthum* . . . (published in 1821). In this book the fear is expressed that the Jews will obtain "a complete domination of the world of ideas" by occupying all strategic positions in the book trade, theater, journalism, reviewing. For a bibliography of the literature for and against the Jews from the emancipation to the second half of the nineteenth century, cf. Eichstaedt, V., *Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Judenfrage* (Hamburg 1938).

F. J. Stahl, who has been rejected by Nazi scholars as an ambiguous alien influence on account of his Jewish origin.<sup>19</sup> Much less attention has been devoted to the leftist, "enlightened," "humanitarian" antisemitism represented in eighteenth-century France by Voltaire, who emphasized the enmity between enlightened humanity and the sordid prejudices of the Jews. Its German representative, Fries, believed that the Jews can dissolve themselves in the nation, completely abandoning their religion, the basis of their alien existence as a kind of parasitic theocracy. Jews can be rescued by participation in the national life and by completely renouncing Judaism. Similiar views were held by Paulus, the liberal Protestant theologian, against whom Gabriel Riesser<sup>20</sup> argued that it was possible to be both a good, progressive German and a Jew in religion. The leftist views were also expressed by Bruno Bauer,<sup>21</sup> the Young Hegelian, whose ideas on the Jewish question were made famous by Karl Marx.<sup>22</sup> Bauer severely criticized the interest of the Jews in emancipation. The Jews, after all, were interested only in their *own* emancipation, and would continue to practice their own religion, whose essence was, according to Bauer, a limitless egoism based on a belief in them-

<sup>19</sup> Botzenhart, *op. cit.*, p. 77, mentions in addition to Friedrich Julius Stahl's *Der Christliche Staat, sein Verhaeltnis zu Deismus und Judentum*, the works of Marcard and Constantin Frantz as defenders of the "Christian state." An antisemitic attack against Stahl is the article of Johannes Heckel, "Der Einbruch des juedischen Geistes in das deutsche Staats- und Kirchenrecht durch Friedrich Julius Stahl," in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* (Hamburg 1935), vol. i. Carl Schmitt, the famous German professor of public law, wrote with admiration about the great conservative Stahl in his *Politische Theologie* (Munich 1922); but after 1933, when he had been for a few years legal expert of the National Socialist government, he attacked Stahl as "Jew Jolson."

<sup>20</sup> Riesser, G., *Ueber die Stellung der Bekenner des mosaischen Glaubens in Deutschland* (1831).

<sup>21</sup> Most important is Bruno Bauer's *Die Judenfrage* (Braunschweig 1843). For a Nazi eulogy of Bauer see Waldkraut, Eckhard, "Germanentum und Judentum in Lebenswerke Bruno Bauers," in *Weltkampf* (September-December 1944).

<sup>22</sup> Marx's criticism of Bauer's views and exposition of his own views on Jews are reprinted in Karl Marx, *Der historische Materialismus*, ed. S. Landshut and J. P. Mayer (Leipzig 1933) and in the *Gesamtausgabe* of Marx-Engels published by the Marx-Engels Institute. A Nazi writer claims that "The contact which he [Marx] had with Germany in his youth, and which stirred up hatred of the Jews in him, was his only contact with reality," Baeumler, A., in *Weltkampf* (May-August 1944) 63.

Cf. my article: "Das Judentum und die Aufklaerung des 19. Jahrhunderts," in M. Oesterreicher's *Die Erfuellung* (Vienna 1936), dealing with B. Bauer's, K. Marx's and E. Duhring's views on the Jews. Marx's second article on the Jewish question is concluded by the statement: "The social emancipation of the Jew is the emancipation of society from Judaism."

selves as the chosen people. In the world of genuine emancipation, that is, emancipation from all religion, the Jews would disappear. Karl Marx accepted Bauer's view that a true emancipation would involve the disappearance of the Jews. But for Marx ideological emancipation from all religion was insufficient. Humanity would have to be liberated from the egoistic bourgeois society whose anti-human spirit was typically expressed by the Jewish spirit of trade, usury and mammonism.

This rejection of Jewish religion and Jewish group life, which were regarded as opposed to humanity and to the triumph of reason and justice, is free from racial antisemitism. The Jewish spirit, which is rejected, is seen as the product of religion and, by Marx, as the expression of bourgeois society. But the starting point for racial antisemitism can be found here very easily, if the Jewish religion is seen as the expression of the race. On such a basis emancipation becomes impossible on the ground that the Jews are by nature separated from other peoples; their evil peculiarities are the necessary expression of their whole being. After some preparation by casual remarks and hints of writers influenced by Renan's antithesis of Aryan to Semitic peoples, the crudest racialism was brutally proclaimed in Eugen Duehring's writings on the Jews.<sup>28</sup> The Jews by race are unnatural and anti-natural; Christianity is also rejected as an expression of Jewish self-hate. This naturalism is directed against the Jews with merciless logic; as parasites and corrupters they must be removed from all public influences; they cannot become men, as Fries and Bauer apparently believed, for they have no human nature. Conversion and all attempts at assimilation are completely meaningless, for they lead only to confusion about the unchangeable evil nature of the Jews. The Jews are a kind of "counter-race" separated from all humanity. The monomaniacal racial antisemitism of Duehring regards the Jewish religion as the evil expression of Jewry's evil nature. The Jews cannot be rescued by emancipation from a religious or social order, as Bauer and Marx believed. To Duehring the Jews, upon renouncing their religion, were not, as they were for Fries, brethren. They remain parasites, for they are condemned to retain their nature. The Jews are the product of an illness of human nature.

<sup>28</sup> Most important is Duehring, E., *Judenfrage* (Karlsruhe and Leipzig 1880). Much, Willi, (Buchnow), *50 Jahre antisemitische Bewegung* (Munich 1937), quotes E. Duehring—besides P. de Lagarde—as the father of racial antisemitism.



# The Rise of Political Antisemitism Under Wilhelm I

The full significance of radical, anti-religious, naturalistic antisemitism was not realized even after the publication of Duehring's works. This was so because emancipation in Germany as elsewhere was completed under the influence of liberal, humanitarian ideas. The critics of Jewish emancipation were helpless before the trend of the time, which had found powerful expression in the demands of the Prussian Diets (*Landtage*) in the eighteen-forties for the completion of this emancipation.<sup>24</sup> Only those who protested against the rise of the modern constitutional and parliamentary regime and against equal rights for all citizens were regarded as advocating special laws for the Jews. Anti-Jewish literature in the sixties and seventies (Noth, Marr)<sup>25</sup> had no influence on the prevailing attitude which culminated in the fulfillment of the emancipation by the North German Confederation in 1869. Bismarck, the great opportunist, had forgotten his anti-emancipation speeches of 1847.<sup>26</sup> But

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Botzenhart, *op. cit.*, p. 90f. The Prussian Diets until 1827 were rather critical of the Emancipation. But in 1843 the Rhineland Diet demanded by a 2/3 majority full civil rights for the Jews. In 1845 almost half of the members of the *Ausschuss* (committee) of the East Prussian Diet requested complete emancipation. All other diets urged the extension of the Emancipation Law of 1812 to all Prussian territories and its complete realization. A legislative proposal of King Friedrich Wilhelm IV based upon the idea of the Christian state introduced at the United Diet of 1847 was faced by a strong opposition composed of liberals and civil servants. This opposition fought attempts to maintain the exclusion of the Jews from civil service and from teaching subjects with religious and ethical implications. Though the opposition was defeated, the government was obliged to permit civil marriage between Jews and non-Jews. Cf. also Dubnow, *op. cit.*, vol. ix, p. 52f.

<sup>25</sup> Naudh, H. (pseud. for Nordmann), *Die Juden und der deutsche Staat* (first ed. 1860; 12th ed. 1877). Naudh claimed that the Jews in their contract with Jahwe had declared war against all peoples (p. 9). Though he makes many racist statements he demands—at least in theory—acceptance of Christianity by Jews. Only then can they be separated from their tribal group and become accessible to culture. H. Marr's *Judenspiegel* was published in 1862. But Marr won success with his pamphlets only in the late seventies. (*Der Sieg des Judentums ueber das Germanentum, Antisemitische Hefte*, etc.) Dubnow, *op. cit.*, vol. x, p. 18, claims that Marr was the son of a Jewish actor. I am unable to find any proof for this statement. An enemy of the Jews, writing in the fifties, was Wagener, the collaborator of Bismarck. According to J. H. Ritter, *Beleuchtung der Wagener'schen Schrift Das Judentum und der Staat* (Berlin 1857), he demanded the transportation of all Jews to Palestine, because they have no sense for the interests of the European humanity; he denied to Jews citizenship rights, etc.

With regard to Marr's ancestry, Fritz Zschaeck has proven him to be of pure "Aryan" stock, although one of his wives was a Jewess and two others half-Jewish; "War Wilhelm Marr ein Jude?" in *Weltkampf* (May-August 1944).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Dubnow, *op. cit.*, vol. ix, p. 56, where there is quoted a speech by young Bismarck in the United Diet of 1847, arguing that Jews ought not be admitted into positions of authority.

he knew, too, that legal emancipation would not mean the complete reversal of political and administrative anti-Jewish practices. Though a racial test was not applied, the Prussian army remained almost free from officers of pure Jewish descent,<sup>27</sup> and higher posts in the administration and judiciary were open only to a few baptized Jews, such as von Simson, etc.

The emancipation was accepted as an unalterable fact even by those who did not like it, but anti-Jewish movements began to emerge only a few years after the completion of emancipation. These movements combined the most varied forms of opposition to the Jews. Until their rise after the foundation of the German Reich, antisemitism in Germany was largely of two kinds. It was either the product of groups who regarded the Jews as not belonging to the German people, and as alien exploiters in alliance with a reactionary upper class; such had been the basis of the *Hep-Hep* disorders after 1815. Or it was an affair of intellectuals who disliked Jewish writers such as Heine or Boerne<sup>28</sup> and envisioned, as Richard Wagner did in his pamphlet against Jewish influence in music, the threat that the Jews with their supposedly superficial commercial spirit would dominate and debase all of German intellectual life.<sup>29</sup> The racialism prepared by a scientist such as Hellweg,<sup>30</sup> who manifestly misused and distorted Renan's negative characterization of the Semitic spirit, and formulated by such philosophers as Duehring, had few conscious adherents. It was an affair of individuals, whose views did not prevail against the general liberal attitude of the educated world. This attitude

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Demeter, Karl, *Das deutsche Heer und seine Offiziere* (Berlin 1931). Demeter discusses (on p. 186f) the attitude of the Prussian officers to the Jews. There was no law against acceptance of Jews as officers, but they were excluded, probably on account of racial feeling (*Rassenempfinden*); after 1885 Jews were not promoted even to the rank of officers of the reserve. Before 1914 a few baptized Jews were found among Prussian reserve officers. The Bavarian practice of accepting Jews as officers in a few cases was, according to Demeter, thoroughly disliked in Prussia. Interesting is Demeter's remark that marriages with Jewesses were not prevented if the Jewesses were wealthy.

<sup>28</sup> Botzenhart, *op. cit.*, quotes Pfizer's article on Heine in *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift* (1838), and Ed. Meyer, *Gegen L. Boerne*.

<sup>29</sup> Karl Richard Ganzer, "Richard Wagner und das Judentum," in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, vol. iii, p. 105f., gives a survey of Wagner's antisemitic utterances. Besides the well-known *Judentum in der Musik*, he considers also the less-known remarks in Wagner's correspondence with Ludwig II. But the National Socialist admirer of Wagner's antisemitism also quotes a letter of Wagner of 30.12.1880, in which he praises an offer of the Jewish opera director, Angelo Neumann, to make his works widely known: "Ein sonderbar energischer und mir sehr ergebener Mann. Wunderbare Fuegungen des Schicksals." (p. 118-199)

<sup>30</sup> L. Strack, "Anti-Semitism," in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. i (1928), quotes from v. Hellweg's article in *Ausland* (1872).

compelled even conservatives who disliked the Jews to accept emancipation as an irreversible fact.

The economic crisis of the seventies, which interrupted a period of artificial boom, changed this mentality somewhat. Though a Jewish leader of the National Liberal party, Lasker, was one of the first to denounce in 1873 the excesses of over-risky, often fraudulent speculation, a literature developed that made the Jews exclusively responsible for it.<sup>31</sup> Glagau, the editor of the popular *Gartenlaube*, emphatically proclaimed that the Jews were the cause of all social ills.<sup>32</sup> The antisemitic pamphlets of Marr, who is commonly credited with having coined the word antisemitism, with their complaints that the Jews dominate and corrupt everything and that Germanism has been defeated by Semitism, now found eager readers. Conservative circles, even if they denied that they were antisemitic, became inclined to use accusations against Jews for political purposes. The series of articles by Parrot in the *Kreuz-Zeitung*, the journalistic mouthpiece of the Prussian conservatives, showed that. Some Catholic groups represented by the Center deputy, Baron Schorlemer, also made the Jews responsible for all the evils of modern liberalism and usury. Sensational articles in *Germania*, the Catholic newspaper of Berlin, accused them of being the instigators of aggressively anti-Christian secularization and particularly of the anti-Catholic *Kulturkampf*. The Center deputies Reichensperger and Julius Bachem were glad to see the anti-Jewish movement, but the most influential Center leader, Windthorst, opposed them: he realized that it would be particularly dangerous for Catholics to undermine the status of a minority group.<sup>33</sup> The well-known conservative opponent of Bismarck, Constantin Frantz,<sup>34</sup> who criticized the new empire as an artificial, anti-traditional

<sup>31</sup> Lasker's speeches were delivered in the Prussian Chamber of Deputies on Jan. 14 and Feb. 17, 1873. Cf. Wawrzinek, K., *Antisemitenparteien (1873-1890)* [Historische Studien, Heft 168], (1927) p. 7f. Wawrzinek also gives a careful survey of the antisemitic press campaign and literature of the seventies.

<sup>32</sup> Glagau's series on the "Boersen und Gruendungsschwindel" was published in the *Gartenlaube* from December 1874 to December 1875. This magazine, as Wawrzinek, *loc. cit.*, p. 8 notes, had a wide circulation in petty bourgeois and liberal circles. The Jews were characterized as men who will not work, but leave it to others; as usurers exclusively interested in the stock exchange, etc.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Frank, W., *Hofprediger Adolf Stoecker und die christlichsoziale Bewegung* (2nd ed. Hamburg 1935) p. 93f. This report on the debate about antisemitism in the Prussian Chamber of Deputies (Nov. 20-25, 1881) quotes Windthorst's remark: "Keine Judenhetze, aber auch keine Katholikenhetze," and also the story of A. Reichensperger's memoirs, according to which Windthorst's views were much opposed in the Center faction.

<sup>34</sup> Constantin Frantz, *Der Nationalliberalismus und die Judenherrschaft* (Munich 1874).

creation of power politics, identified the Jews with the evil national-liberal spirit which permeated the whole Reich of the Iron Chancellor. Enemies of Bismarck liked to picture him as dominated by Jews and to denounce his regime as a Jewish regime.<sup>35</sup>

But this antisemitic wave appeared as a somewhat eccentric and demagogic affair, despite all the anti-Jewish articles in influential papers. Antisemitism became acceptable in academic circles only after Heinrich von Treitschke had published articles on the Jewish question in his *Preussische Jahrbuecher* (1879-80).<sup>36</sup> It developed into a political movement only after one of the court chaplains, Adolf Stoecker, had publicly attacked the alleged undue influence of secularized Jews. Neither Treitschke nor Stoecker was a racial antisemite. Treitschke opposed the immigration of East-European Jews whose sons would climb to dominant positions in German life. He attacked the historian Heinrich Graetz, who had assailed eminent Germans for their anti-Jewish attitude. He feared that the Jews were forming a clan of their own and would exercise a negative, dissolving influence on national life and unity. They must therefore be regarded as "our misfortune," as he put it, thus coining a slogan which became very popular among antisemites. He recommended complete assimilation, whereas racial antisemites regarded assimilation as impossible, as a mere attempt at mimicry by parasites. But Treitschke's reputation as a national and liberal historian and publicist induced many to accept with quiet conscience the belief that the Jews exercised a negative influence in German life.

Court chaplain Stoecker<sup>37</sup> was a typical representative of the con-

<sup>35</sup> The *Kreuzzeitung* pictured Bismarck as being dependent on the Jews. This accusation was used by the bitter enemies of Bismarck who formed the so-called Antikanzlerliga. Its most aggressive paper was the *Deutsche Eisenbahnzeitung* of J. Gehlsen. This paper wrote on February 17, 1876, that the Jewish question could be only solved by the removal of the present system and its representative (Wawrzinek, *op. cit.*, p. 11).

<sup>36</sup> On Treitschke cf. Kohn, Hans, in *Review of Politics* (October 1945). In his answer to Treitschke, Mommsen, Th., *Auch ein Wort über unser Judenthum* (Berlin 1880), emphasized that the claims regarding a mass immigration of Eastern Jews were vastly exaggerated and that the German Jews were one of the many components from which the German people had been formed: "Was heisst das sie [the Jews] sollen Deutsche werden? Sie sind es ja, so gut wie er und ich." Eduard von Hartmann's *Das Judenthum in Gegenwart und Zukunft* (2nd ed. Leipzig 1885) was regarded by many Jews as antisemitic because the author did not believe the assimilation was complete, while the antisemites rejected him because of his faith in assimilation. Even Treitschke was regarded by the Nazis as too pro-Jewish; cf. Bauer, Wilhelm, "Treitschke und die Juden," in *Weltkampf* (May-August 1944).

<sup>37</sup> The most revealing book on Stoecker is that of the National Socialist W. Frank (cf. note 33). Its antisemitic tendency is so obvious that the value judgments can be easily corrected. W. Frank's book is used for the description of Stoecker's life and conflicts.

temporary mixture of unquestioning, narrow Protestant orthodoxy and Prussian patriotism. Of poor and humble origin, his early interest in the social question was further stimulated by jealousy of such Catholics as Bishop von Ketteler, who had anticipated Protestant church leaders in recognizing that the rise of the proletariat posed new problems for the Christian care of souls. He became a leader of the Berlin Home Mission; his duties as a chaplain at the court of Wilhelm I did not occupy much of his time. Resolving to fight the rise of anti-Christian, anti-patriotic and anti-monarchical socialism in the German capital, he started a series of mass meetings and founded a Christian Socialist Workers' party (1878). His public debates with socialists caused a sensation but failed to win the workers, who regarded him as a man condescending to the masses from the authoritative heights of royalty and nobility. His adherents were mostly middle-class people, who were inclined to regard themselves as victims of Jewish economic expansion and who resented what they regarded as the rootlessness and radicalism of Jewish influence on public life, particularly on journalism and politics. In 1879 he began public debates on the Jewish question. He advised the Jews to be more humble and more modest and to refrain from spreading their anti-religious spirit into public life,<sup>88</sup> while disclaiming any dislike of the quiet religious Jew or of the converted Jew. The famous leader of Protestant caritative works, Pastor Bodelschwingh, even claimed that Stoecker liked the pious and retiring Jews.<sup>89</sup> Some public remarks (1881) against the wealth of Bismarck's banker, Bleichroeder, caused Stoecker much trouble, for Bismarck disliked any meddling in politics by clergymen. The Iron Chancellor regarded Stoecker as a dangerous demagogue, as a socialist, and even considered the possibility of applying the anti-socialist legislation against him. Though the liberal Crown Prince, the future Frederick III, despised Stoecker as a barbarous demagogue and called the anti-semitic agitation disgraceful, the patronage of Wilhelm I saved the court chaplain. The old emperor was pleased to have the "overbearing" Jews frightened. In a second crisis, Wilhelm, disturbed by the court chaplain's

<sup>88</sup> Typical is his speech on modern Jewry in Berlin, quoted after the 4th ed., 1880. There he accused the Berlin Jews of forming a powerful and wealthy closed community without any participation in Christian German life (p. 17).

<sup>89</sup> In a letter to Crown Prince Friedrich (Aug. 22, 1885) Bodelschwingh wrote: ". . . Stoecker ist nicht etwa ein Feind der Juden. Ich moechte behaupten dass die Juden wenig so echte Freunde haben als ihn. Stoecker hat nie die Religion der Juden angegriffen . . ." (Frank, *op. cit.*, p. 312)

brutal methods of agitation, turned against Stoecker, who was this time supported by Prince Wilhelm, the future Wilhelm II.

Strangely enough, however, the radical antisemites were most troublesome for Stoecker.<sup>40</sup> These had formed groups particularly in Berlin and Dresden, and Stoecker co-operated with them, for he was completely unable to use his success as a speaker for the organization of disciplined followers. In these groups racial antisemitism was important; Henrici, e.g., one of the Berlin leaders, admired Duehring, and even for such conservatives as von Liebermann-Sonnenberg, Stoecker did not go far enough. They could not understand Stoecker's refusal to begin an open fight for the revocation of the emancipation. In these circles there was also much support for radical economic programs which were unacceptable to Stoecker, who after all was connected with the court and could not break with the Conservative party. This party resented any social and agrarian radicalism which would link "Junkers and Jews" together. Radical antisemitism itself was split into several groups: there was a middle-class element; there were aristocratic adherents of a feudal past, and urban doctrinaires on the one hand, and on the other, romantic admirers (Boeckel in Hesse) of a pure Germanic folk past who as skillful propagandists sought to win the debt-depressed peasants by opposing Junkers and Jews.<sup>41</sup>

But in spite of all conflicts, which nullified any attempt to organize an international antisemitic movement, a foundation was prepared for various political groups which succeeded in electing members to the Reichstag. Because of the radicalism of these movements and of their inclination towards an avowedly un-Christian antisemitism, such conservative and orthodox Protestants as Stoecker could not in the long run co-operate with them. These movements, however, could not compete with the radical social demands of the Social Democrats, whose leaders

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Wawrzinek, p. 37, where Stoecker's protests against racial antisemitism but also against any Jewish influence on German life are quoted, and p. 51. Cf. also Frank, p. 80f. For Frank it is a limitation of Stoecker's that he sided rather with the conservatives than with the radical antisemites.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Wawrzinek, *op. cit.*, p. 64f. Boeckel was the first antisemite to be elected a member of the Reichstag. He won his victory against Dr. Grimm who, as a Conservative, had represented this constituency of Marburg-Frankenstein for a long time. Boeckel openly fought the Conservative party which was "led by Junkers and climbers." He announced that he was proud to have been the first to demand liberation from Stoecker, the false antisemite. Boeckel also quarrelled with such racial but reactionary antisemites as von Liebermann who criticized his co-operation with left-wing Liberals and Social Democrats in some votes of the Reichstag. (Wawrzinek, *op. cit.*, p. 68)

not only successfully suppressed the antisemitic stirrings of some local party groups inclined to identify Jews and capitalism, but denounced antisemitism as "the socialism of the stupid" (Bebel). The antisemitic groups were regarded as backward middle-class elements and peasants, under the leadership of more or less monomaniacal doctrinaires, who substituted hatred of the Jews for all political thinking and action. Typical of this attitude were Nietzsche's judgments about his brother-in-law Foerster, a leading antisemitic agitator. Nietzsche almost became a philosemite in reaction against the narrow-minded fanaticism of his sister's husband.<sup>41a</sup>

Antisemitic demagogic successes were of course possible. Thus in the early eighties Bismarck made use of antisemitic agitation in order to fight left-wing liberals who had refused to accept his change from free trade to a protective tariff policy.<sup>42</sup> In the nineties the antisemitic deputy Ahlwardt created a sensation when he denounced Jewish contractors for army material. Nationalistic groups disliked Jews; an influential student society, *Der Verein Deutscher Studenten*, organized in 1880, explicitly accepted antisemitism.<sup>43</sup>

In Austria racial antisemitism became the basis for the introduction of the "Aryan paragraph" which excluded persons of Jewish descent from associations for gymnastics.<sup>44</sup> Austrian racial, pan-German antisemites under Schoenerer conducted a noisy rather than influential agitation against the Hapsburgs and the Catholic Church. Their activities have a general importance only because they influenced Hitler.<sup>45</sup> A middle-class antisemitism, traditionalist and economic in its roots, and much less

<sup>41a</sup> Nietzsche's philosemitism, interpreted as an expression of his hatred of the Germans, is contrasted with J. Burckhardt's moderate antisemitism by von Martin, A., *Nietzsche und Burckhardt* (3rd ed. Basel 1945).

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Wawrzinek, *op. cit.*, who is inclined to believe that Bismarck helped to support antisemitic agitation in Berlin by his famous secret fund, the so-called *Reptilienfond*. But that was done only in order to fight the left-wing Liberals (the *Fortschrittler*) for whom many Jews voted. As the antisemites had not the expected electoral success, they were promptly forgotten by Bismarck; even during the period of his secret help to antisemitism, the Iron Chancellor had publicly congratulated Prof. Goldschmidt who fought the influence of the *Fortschrittler* among the Jews.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Heuss, Theodor, *Friedrich Naumann* (Stuttgart 1937) p. 40f. The Verein aimed at the combination of a nationalism above all parties with the fight against Jewish influence. It had originated with a drive to get signatures for the antisemitic petition.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Much (Buchnow), *50 Jahre antisemitische Bewegung*.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Karbach, Oscar, "The Founder of Political Antisemitism: Georg von Schoenerer," in *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. vii (1945) 3-30.

nationalist and doctrinaire, was exploited by the skillful politician Lueger. Originally a liberal, Lueger became the most popular mayor of the Austrian capital, partly because Emperor Franz Josef opposed him and refused to approve his election. Lueger opposed "Jewish influence" but was no fanatical doctrinaire prepared to crush and exterminate the Jews.

In spite of the alliance between German nationalism and racial anti-semitism in Austria, expressed in the agitation against secularized Jews by Stoecker, and in spite of the election of antisemitic deputies and some sensational campaigns, such as the revival of the ritual murder charge in Germany (Xanten case, 1891), antisemitism did not become an influential political and social force in Imperial Germany. But it is true that the Jews—as the Nazi historian, Frank, notes<sup>46</sup>—were kept out of all political and military positions in the Reich of the Hohenzollerns. The concessions made to some baptized Jews only prove that this anti-Jewish policy was based upon the unconscious acceptance of the idea of the Christian state. The modern secularized German state persisted in its dislike of Jews in positions of authority, but it rejected the demand of the antisemites—expressed for instance in the petition of 1881<sup>47</sup>—that this sentiment and practice be explicitly legalized.

It would be wrong, on the other hand, to regard F. Naumann's development as typical of German nationalism.<sup>48</sup> Naumann started his public career in the eighteen-eighties as a co-founder of the anti-Jewish society mentioned above, Verein Deutscher Studenten. As a disciple of Stoecker, he regretted the Jewish emancipation, though he believed that it should not be revoked. After some acquaintance with Jews he recognized that the social question was not identical with the Jewish question. Thereafter he urged that Jews be judged only as individuals and finally argued that German national greatness consisted precisely in its power of assimilating various elements.<sup>49</sup> Though even the anti-Polish Ost-

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Frank, *op. cit.*, p. 240.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Dubnow, *op. cit.*, vol. x, p. 32f. This petition with 300,000 signatures was presented to Bismarck in March 1881, and remained unanswered. Its four main demands were: (1) limitation of Jewish immigration; (2) dismissal of Jews from all important civil service positions, particularly of Jewish judges; (3) exclusion of Jews from teaching in grammar schools and their strict limitation in high schools and universities; (4) a special census of Jews. The petition mentioned racial qualities as the sources of the evil and corrupting Jewish influence.

<sup>48</sup> Heuss, *op. cit.*, p. 11ff.

<sup>49</sup> Heuss, *op. cit.*, p. 312.



marken Verein and the pan-Germans were not in principle racial antisemites—the leader of the pan-Germans, the geographer Hasse, distinguished East-European from German Jews,—a more or less outspoken intellectual and social antipathy against Jews prevailed. Walter Rathenau and the baptized publicist Maximilian Harden,<sup>50</sup> both of whom were to become victims of antisemitic attacks, themselves gave a clear expression of these feelings. Both of them criticized what they called Jewish anti-Germanism and excessive Jewish influence in public life, especially in intellectual and journalistic circles.

### *Cultural Antisemitism Under Wilhelm II*

The antipathy to Jews which prevailed did not, however, involve admiration of proponents of thoroughgoing antisemitism. A historian of literature like A. Bartels, who discovered Jewish influence everywhere in German life and attacked it relentlessly, was regarded as a crackpot; nor were the works of Fritsch, who devoted all his life to founding antisemitic organizations and publishing houses, and was the editor of the antisemitic bible, *Handbuch zur Judenfrage*, ever quoted by respectable writers and scholars. In 1892 the Conservative party included in its platform a plank directed against "destructive Jewish influence,"<sup>51</sup> but this did not indicate a design or even a desire to take away citizenship rights from Jews. From his youth Wilhelm II was inclined to violent antisemitic outbursts. Yet even he did not refrain from associating publicly with Ballin and Rathenau, and because of this, uncompromising antisemites called him the "semi-emperor."

<sup>50</sup> National Socialist antisemites frequently reported these attitudes. E.g., W. Frank in his article on Harden, "Apostata und das Wilhelminische Deutschland," in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, vol. iii (1938) p. 11: "Die Abneigung, die manche hervorragenden Vertreter seiner Rasse gegen 'Handelsleute und Juden als solche' nach einem Worte Boernes zur Schau tragen, hat er, besonders in seinen jüngeren Jahren zur Schau getragen." And Verschur, in his article, "Rassenbiologie der Juden," *loc. cit.*, p. 141, quotes the sentence of Walter Rathenau: "Seltsame Vision.—Auf maerischem Sand eine asiatische Horde." This passage from W. Rathenau's *Impressionen* (Leipzig 1902) is also quoted in the National Socialist publication, *Die Juden in Deutschland* (3rd ed. Munich 1936) p. 13. Cf. Harden on Jewish money-power in Frank, W., *Affäre Dreyfus* (Hamburg 1939) p. 34. Gregor Schwartz-Bostunitch opens his *Juedischer Imperialismus* (5th ed. 1939) with a quotation from Rathenau. Cf. also Frank, W., "Walter Rathenau und die blonde Rasse," in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, vol. iv (1940) 9-67: "Walter Rathenau's very bodily self was affected by the inferiority feeling of his race." (p. 20)

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Frank, W., *op. cit.*, p. 233. Shortly before this the antisemite Ahlwardt had inflicted an overwhelming defeat upon the Conservative candidate in the traditionally Conservative constituency of Friedeberg Arnswalde. He was elected by a vote of 6,973 to 2,876.

Crude racial antisemites, who pictured the Jews as *the* evil and tried to form a kind of universal anti-Jewish front, which would rise above all differences, were not highly regarded in the circles of *Besitz und Bildung*, which ruled the state and dominated society. Duehring was completely forgotten,—even the romantic folk antisemitism, according to which the Jew was unassimilable, and Wagnerian antisemitism were not directly influential forces. Yet there was a powerful and sophisticated antisemitic tradition. It was usual to identify the Jews with vulgarity, superficial activities, and an inability to understand the real depth of the German soul. P. de Lagarde, who was a respected critic of modern German life, held the opinion that a German revival would require not only the substitution of a German faith for the Christian churches but also the elimination of Jewish influence.<sup>52</sup> Although his views were not widely accepted, for he was thought of more as an outsider, he typified the tendency to ascribe a particular mission and religion to the Germanic soul. The consequences of such attitudes were often overlooked, for they were opposed to Christian traditionalism, with which antisemites appeared more or less connected, despite their anti-Christian and revolutionary agitation.

The most successful and representative expression of these attitudes was Houston Stewart Chamberlain's *Foundations of the XIXth Century*.<sup>53</sup> In it the Germanic-Aryan race and its mission were extolled; the Semitic race, and particularly its Jewish derivative,—for the Jews were for Chamberlain only half-Semites,<sup>54</sup>—were deprecated. The book was written by an apparently well-educated and widely-read man. It could be found in all public and private libraries, including those of Jews. Chamberlain was a Wagnerian, who rose above the somewhat sectarian claims of the Wagner disciples of the *Bayreuther Blaetter*, as well as an admirer

<sup>52</sup> Paul de Lagarde, *Deutsche Schriften* (5th ed. Munich 1920). The preface to the first edition is dated 1885. Characteristic of de Lagarde's attitude towards the Jews is the lecture of 1853, "Ueber die gegenwartigen Aufgaben der deutschen Politik" (p. 18ff.): the Jews are a nation in the nation and their national character is produced by their religious tradition. De Lagarde apparently rejected crude racialism but believed that Jews can be "melted down" (p. 26) in the German nation only if Judaism disappears; this can happen only after the Protestant and Catholic Churches have made place for a new German, truly Christian religion.

<sup>53</sup> On Chamberlain, cf. E. Seillière's book (Paris 1917). *The Foundations* will be quoted according to the 19th German edition published in 1919.

<sup>54</sup> Chamberlain, *Foundations*, vol. 1, p. 441, characterizes the Jews as hybrids, as products of a mixture between incompatible racial types. He is manifestly influenced by Gobineau's belief that racial mixture means decay.

of Goethe, Kant, Renan and Voltaire.<sup>55</sup> He was not dominated by a narrow-minded, orthodox Lutheranism, which made Stoecker unacceptable to most members of the educated class; he was adept in presenting an individualized spiritual interpretation of Christ's message. Though he believed in Germany's mission, he emphasized—at least in the years before World War I—publicly that he was above all the politics of his day and the strife of parties. His brand of antisemitism was embarrassing for those to whom an antisemite was an illiterate barbarian with no intellectual interests and esthetic taste, a more or less skillful and cynical demagogue (though closer analysis indicated that Chamberlain was a literate crackpot). He mentioned occasionally that he was opposed to making the Jews scapegoats,<sup>56</sup> and he held aloof from the vulgar antisemites. On the other hand, his analysis of the dominant role of Jews in the modern world ascribed to them the same destructive function as did antisemitic writings. While in his letters Chamberlain emphasized that he had Jewish friends and even enjoyed business-relations with decent Jews,<sup>57</sup> he attacked—especially in his correspondence with Wilhelm II—Jewish influence as intolerable and used the most surprising arguments. He told the Emperor that the majority of democrats and a large number of professors of theology were Jews or of Jewish descent.<sup>58</sup> Though he was much more widely read than Lagarde and in addition to Wilhelm II had many influential admirers, Chamberlain's real political influence did not develop until he was already somewhat forgotten. He is of permanent significance as the inspirer of the Nazi world outlook, a vulgarized and barbarized version of his thought, which resulted in the justification of the utmost "realism" for the sake of an idealism beyond all time and space. The best race is at the same time the most deeply religious. The fight for it and against the "counter race" is a holy mission. It is characteristic that Chamberlain, after he had been discredited for his pan-Germanic pamphlets of World War I, old and

<sup>55</sup> Cf. his autobiography, *Lebenswege meines Denkens*.

<sup>56</sup> *Foundations*, vol. i, p. 19ff., where he protested against the "ridiculous and revolting inclination to make the Jew the general scapegoat for all vices of our time." The Jewish danger is not created by the Jews but by ourselves, is an illness of our own soul, etc.

<sup>57</sup> Chamberlain, H. St., *Briefe 1882-1924*, (Munich 1928). Letter to L. von Schroeder of Dec. 26, 1907: "Ich selber habe liebe und verehrte juedische Freunde gehabt und finde namentlich den geschaeflichen Verkehr mit redlichen und geschickten Juden besonders angenehm." (p. 169) After this sentence Chamberlain developed a program for excluding Jews from cultural life ("aus unserem Kulturleben ausschalten"). (p. 171)

<sup>58</sup> *Briefe*, vol. ii, p. 154 (letter of February 20, 1902): "Unsere Demokraten [sind] in der Mehrzahl und unsere Theologieprofessoren in grosser Zahl Juden oder Judenstaemmlinge."

paralyzed, prophesied to Hitler his political mission as a leader of the German people.<sup>59</sup>

Chamberlain's antisemitism was, nevertheless, in fact rather vague. If he liked certain Jews, then they were not Jews and were free of the traits of the Jewish race (or racial mixture). The *Foundations* was dedicated to a man whose ancestry would not have met the requirements of Nazi legislation. Occasionally he even conceded that there could be a truly humanized Jew.<sup>60</sup> Many aspects of his work were admired by liberals; A. von Harnack wrote enthusiastic letters to Chamberlain about his *Goethe*, although he rejected his view of the Jews as a blend of incompatible racial elements, brought and held together by power-hungry priests, and separated from the fundamental trends of European civilization, which was dominated by Germanic peoples. Chamberlain regarded the Latins and Slavs as of Germanic origin; later, however, he viewed all opposition to Germany's power as an expression of decay and hate of Germanism; he considered the English particularly as becoming more and more de-Germanized. It was typical of Chamberlain to misuse metaphysical and idealistic arguments for advancing power politics and covering up prejudices.

This "cultural" antisemitism, publicly aloof from all alliance with the vulgar, mass variety,—only in a private letter did Chamberlain venture to recommend Fritsch as a source of information on Jewish influence—looked upon the Jews as more or less responsible for the decadence of modern life. They were the journalists who influenced and debased public opinion. They were the originators of evil capitalism, as Sombart's *The Jew and Modern Economic Life* seemed to prove for many readers. They were destructive agitators and demagogues. In their intellectual activities the Jews, it was claimed, exploited and misused the productive work of others. Although this attitude aroused a violent antisemitism in some groups, e.g., in the German Youth movement, it was a vague feeling and a non-political attitude. An attempt to be consistent and to implement it with a program for the exclusion of Jews from public life, such a concentration of interest on the Jewish question was regarded as some-

<sup>59</sup> *Briefe*, vol. ii, letter to Hitler of Oct. 7, 1923. Chamberlain wrote that Hitler is not a fanatic, because he wishes to persuade, and he stated: "Dass Deutschland in der Stunde seiner hoechsten Not sich einen Hitler gebiert, das bezeugt sein Lebendigsein."

<sup>60</sup> *Foundations*, vol. i, p. 555. Contradicting racialist statements, Chamberlain declared that a Jew who has abandoned the idea of Judaism has "*ipso facto* also left the Jewish nationality determined by a belief." On p. 554 a Jew is defined by a peculiar kind of feeling and of thinking; non-Jews can become Jews by reading Jewish papers, meeting Jews, etc.

what embarrassing. Such a book as Weininger's *Sex and Character* (1903), which presented the Jews as men without loyalty and substance, rather like the English, or like women, two other objects of the author's hatred, was considered eccentric—and not only because it was written by a Jew whose self-hatred finally and logically drove him to suicide.

To summarize, the situation under Wilhelm II was as follows. Anti-semitic mass-agitation remained a parochial affair. The Center party, recognizing that it was dangerous to start an agitation against a minority group, had suppressed antisemitic tendencies which had appeared during the *Kulturkampf*. There was no Lueger among German Catholic leaders, although there were some complaints against the anti-Christian writings and attitudes of Jews. Conservatives and agrarian organizers did not believe that the Jewish question was a central and decisive one. Cultural and intellectual antisemitism was an attitude without a political and legal program. Quite typical was the position of Wilhelm II who, in spite of all his outbursts against Jewish *Frechheit*, did not even think of allying himself with antisemites, as Tsar Nicholas II did. Radical mass antisemitism was a possibility as the result of the agitations of Boekel, among others, against Junkers and Jews.<sup>61</sup> But this was blocked by the popular identification of social radicalism with the Social Democrats whose leaders had suppressed all antisemitic tendencies. There may have been some labor leaders who resented the influence of such foreign-born Jews in the German Socialist party as Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Radek, but they were unable to give public expression to their feelings.

### *Antisemitism During World War I and the Weimar Republic*

The outbreak of World War I appeared to end antisemitic agitation. The antisemitic *Staatsbuerger Zeitung* was banned as a violator of the *Burgfriede*, the truce among all parties, symbolized by Wilhelm II's words: "Henceforth, I know no parties—only Germans." Prominent Jews played a role in the prosecution of the war; the War Ministry accepted the services of Walter Rathenau for economic organization; Haber was a leading figure in the development of chemical warfare. But soon the situation changed. Complaints were made that Jews were too powerful in the various *Kriegsgesellschaften* and that they did not have a proportionate share of dangerous military jobs. In 1916, when the Prussian

<sup>61</sup> The antisemitic vote for the Reichstag: 1901—461,000; 1912—376,000. But this vote was never large enough to have a political weight.

War Ministry compiled statistics showing the religious groups within the armed forces, the figures were believed to be serving antisemitic purposes.<sup>62</sup> Yet there were Jews who supported extreme nationalism; Prof. Ludwig Bernhard, of Jewish origin, belonged to the circle around the pan-German industrialist Hugenberg and some Jews approved the agitation of Admiral Tirpitz for unrestricted submarine warfare. The rightist groups, nevertheless, hinted that Jewish influence was on the side of those working for a moderate and, therefore, in their eyes, a bad and anti-German peace. In particular the Independent Socialist party, which had refused to vote the war budget and in 1916 had broken away from the majority Socialists, was identified with the Jews. It was overlooked that a Jew of Russian origin, Helphand (Parvus), edited the most ultra-nationalistic socialist publication, the weekly *Glocke*, whose contributors included Winning and Krieck, later members of the National-Socialist party, as well as the Prussian Socialist leader Heilmann, who died in a concentration camp of the Third Reich.

The collapse of Imperial Germany intensified the antisemitic agitation which had begun during the war. This fact was due to a variety of causes. First, there was the increase of antisemitism among the ruling classes of the old monarchical system. Among them were many who, with Wilhelm II, were inclined to blame the Jews for the defeat and make them responsible for all domestic defeatist propaganda. It is characteristic that after the war the antisemitism expressed in the letters of Chamberlain became more violent and concrete. He suggested not to hang the Jews but to regard them as aliens, and subject to expulsion as such.<sup>63</sup> Secondly, the Jews were widely believed to have profited from the war, which the German people had lost and which had in particular affected the chances of the previous ruling classes for a career and advancement. The democratic Weimar constitution opened all government positions to the Jews, in practice as well as in theory, and presently most fantastic stories about the influx of Jews into official jobs gained currency. The fact that for a few months Jewish politicians played a role in the government, replacing those of the old regime, was not forgotten, though these men soon disappeared from leading positions. The Bavarian Prime Minister, Kurt Eisner, was assassinated and Hirsch, who had been the Prussian Prime Minister, accepted a minor job in a municipality. Democratic

<sup>62</sup> Dubnow, *op. cit.*, vol. x, p. 516.

<sup>63</sup> *Briefe*, vol. ii, p. 72. Letter of Jan. 7, 1919 to Jacob von Uexkuell.

ideology was pictured as Jewish, as the victory of an anti-German, Semitic mentality, even though the Republic attempted to relate itself to the German democratic tradition of 1848. Thirdly, the communist danger was identified with the Jews; the Bolsheviks were pictured as a Jewish gang. Characteristic of this agitation was the false rumor that the wealthy Jew, Rathenau, had married the sister of Radek, who was reputed to have been sent by the Jews of Moscow to bolshevize Germany. The *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* began their successful career.<sup>64</sup> Bolsheviks, Jews and Masons—and on occasion Jesuits and ultramontanists as well—were identified as and transformed into interchangeable heads of world conspiracies. The most famous representative of this school was General Ludendorff.<sup>65</sup>

Nationalism and antisemitism had been sometimes linked yet very often dissociated in the German Reich of Bismarck and Wilhelm II; now they became more and more often combined. And even more important was the fact that antisemitism now assumed the character of a revolutionary weapon, of a most important instrument of opposition against existing social conditions. It is noteworthy that the significance of this development of postwar antisemitism was not fully appreciated at first in Germany. The antisemitism of 1918-1924, from the collapse of the Hohenzollern Empire to the stabilization of the mark, seemed to be only a kind of foam on a stormy surface, which would eventually settle down.

The various nationalistic, secret and military organizations were all antisemitic. The symbol of the swastika appeared on the helmet of Captain Ehrhardt's Brigade which participated in the Kapp *putsch* (1920). The Weimar Republic, with its alleged gullibility in regard to foreign powers and its ruling "anti-national" parties, was pictured as a "Jew Republic." Songs demanding the blood of Jews became popular. The Deutsch-Völkische Schutz und Trutz Bund, a radical antisemitic organization, won many supporters, though an official prohibition destroyed it—or rather, caused it to be replaced by other organizations.

<sup>64</sup> The best American survey of the history of this forgery is given by Curtiss, J. S., *An Appraisal of the Protocols of Zion* (New York 1942). The German Catholic Bishops restated the origin of the "Protocols" correctly in their refutation of Rosenberg's *Myth of the Twentieth Century*, published as a supplement to various diocesan papers during the Nazi regime.

<sup>65</sup> A summary of the views of the general is to be found in his and his wife's volume: *Die Judenmacht, ihr Wesen und Ende* (Munich 1938). Therein it is stated that the Masons are today Jews (p. 59), that the baptism of children has a Jewish meaning, but that Christian suggestions have today no influence on those who really know their racial inherited substance (p. 216).

Secret nationalistic societies were favored and protected in Munich by officials of the Bavarian government. The Bavarian Socialist Prime Minister, Hoffmann, was compelled to resign during the Kapp *putsch* which succeeded in the Bavarian capital, though not spectacularly, whereas it clearly failed in Berlin. Foreign Minister Walter Rathenau became a victim of antisemitic agitation, which described him as an agent of the Elders of Zion, of "Jewish World Capitalism," bolshevism, etc. He was assassinated (1922) and a similar attempt on Harden's life failed. Hans Blueher, a somewhat esoteric writer, who, however, enjoyed a wide influence among the younger generation, especially in the youth movement, forgot that he had supported the Jewish student Joel when the latter was excluded from the University of Berlin by Rector von Willamowitz-Moellendorf, the old adversary of Nietzsche, and published in 1922 a pamphlet, *Secessio Judaica*, describing the necessity of a separation between Jews and the German people, which, he claimed, was then taking place. Hindenburg was a mythical expression of German substance, he argued, but no service to the German people would make them overlook the Jewish blood of Minister Rathenau.<sup>66</sup>

But this antisemitism was not recognized as really important by the parties backing or opposing the government. It was seen as a product of resentment in turbulent times and of a lack of maturity. There were no organized antisemitic parties to win electoral campaigns. It is true that the successors of the Conservatives, the German Nationalists, put some remarks against destructive influences in their platform. Miss von Gierke, the daughter of the well-known historian of law and of a mother of Jewish origin, was compelled by the pressure of some racialists to abandon her parliamentary career as a German Nationalist member of the Reichstag. On the other hand the *Völkischen*, the racialists, such men as Graefe, Wulle and von Henning, had to quit the party (1922), while another rabid nationalist, general director Hugenberg, employed Jews in his various enterprises. His leftist enemies were fond of pointing out that one of his leading newspaper editors was a Dr. Breslauer.

### *The Antisemitism of the Nazis*

The importance of Adolf Hitler and his antisemitic agitation was not realized. Hitler appeared as one of the nationalist agitators who, sup-

<sup>66</sup> Later he became more openly antisemitic, accusing Jews of being responsible for modern secularization and humanitarianism; e.g., in his book *Der Kampf Israels gegen die christlichen Güter* (Hamburg 1931).



ported by some Bavarian officials and Reichswehr officers, flourished in Munich after the collapse of the shortlived Soviet Republic, which had been established in a somewhat farcical way after the assassination of Kurt Eisner.<sup>67</sup> He seemed to be an agent of army circles whose exponent was Captain Roehm. These circles did not like the republic, which was held responsible for the humiliating Peace of Versailles. Its representatives were despised democratic and socialist politicians. Through such men as the nationalistic and antisemitic poet, Dietrich Eckart, and through such Baltic nationalistic refugees as von Scheubner-Richter and Alfred Rosenberg, Hitler was connected with pan-German circles. Members of one of these circles had been arrested and executed as hostages during the last days of the Munich Soviet Republic, some of whose leaders tried to imitate the Paris Commune. His connections with the Munich police president, Poehner, and with *Amtmann* Frick were most valuable, and these men rendered important services to the rising National Socialist Workers' party. Hitler, although he had joined it only as member number 7, soon became undisputed leader, after having pushed its founder, Drexel, into the background. The program of this party resumed old antisemitic demands: Jews cannot be citizens; Jews who have immigrated since 1914 must be expelled; the Jews must be regarded as guests, etc.; Jewish enterprises, particularly the department stores, must be expropriated, etc. The speeches of Hitler accused the Jews of being responsible for both parasitic capitalism and destructive communism; the Jews were the exploiters of German defeat and instigators of revolutions for their own profit.<sup>68</sup>

All these demands and views were not remarkable for their originality—they were self-evident in all nationalistic circles; what was remarkable was the demagogic and oratorical skill with which they were presented. These tricks won Hitler great success not only in mass meetings attended by the Munich middle class but also in society circles. He was introduced to H. St. Chamberlain in Bayreuth—a proof of his connection with the Wagnerians—and to General Ludendorff, who after the Kapp *putsch* had moved to the more hospitable environment of the Bavarian capital.

\* The best-known biography of Hitler is that of Konrad Heiden, *Der Fuehrer* (New York 1944), which does not completely supersede Heiden's *History of National Socialism* (New York 1935). Cf. also my articles, "The Sources of Hitler's Power," in *Review of Politics* (Oct. 1943) and "Hitler the Simplifier of German Nationalism," *loc. cit.* (July 1945).

\* Cf. Baynes, Norman H., ed., *The Speeches of Adolf Hitler, April 1922-August 1939* (London 1942) 2 vols. The section on the Jews contains only a small part of Hitler's antisemitic utterances.

Ludendorff was at this time regarded as the most important figure of the nationalistic movement in active opposition to the Weimar Republic.<sup>69</sup> But only after the Hitler *putsch* (November 1923) did the views of General Ludendorff become universally known. Under the influence of Dr. von Kemnitz, whom he married after divorcing his first wife (who was apparently of Jewish descent), he developed a system which explained not only the German defeat but everything in history in terms of the devilish influence of "super-state" (*ueberstaatliche*) powers: Jews, Masons, Jesuits, who deceive and destroy the people. In the long run he lost his influence not only because of his quarrelsome character and domineering behavior but also because of his lack of respect for tradition. He attacked the Bible as a Jewish book, he accused the Mason Goethe of having caused the murder of Schiller, and he opposed Hindenburg. He had a naive, monomaniacal and boring belief in his ability to discover secret symbols and their real meaning. But before 1924 Ludendorff was a universally respected figure, the great general of World War I rather than the leader of a small but noisy sect, the Tannenberg Bund.<sup>70</sup>

In 1923 Hitler's first attempt to seize power failed. He tried to exploit the national excitement in Bavaria, where the government, controlled by conservative Catholics, also believed that the end of the Weimar Republic in Berlin was imminent. His *putsch* did not succeed because he was abandoned by the regular army under General von Lossow and by the administration under von Kahr; both men were unwilling to accept his authority and were offended by the illegal and violent methods by which he tried to force their consent.

Not until almost ten years later did Hitler become master of Germany, upon his appointment as chancellor by President von Hindenburg. The legal mind was now satisfied. The appointment was made after he had succeeded in organizing a mass party with a strong representation in the Reichstag. In September 1930 had occurred the fateful elections which revealed to the world the extent of the spell under which Hitler held the masses, for 107 National Socialist deputies were elected.

<sup>69</sup> Chamberlain remarks in his letter to Hitler: "Dass der grossartige Ludendorff sich offen Ihnen anschliesst und sich zu der Bewegung bekennt, die von Ihnen ausgeht: welch herrliche Bestaetigung." (*Briefe*, vol II, p. 126)

<sup>70</sup> The attacks in Hitler's *Mein Kampf* against a sectarian tactic of certain folkish circles which endangered their political success by attacking openly the Christian churches, were manifestly directed against Ludendorff, though the name of the general is never mentioned.

What role did antisemitism play in this success? In 1927 Wawrzinek, in his useful study of the rise of the antisemitic parties in Germany during the seventies and eighties, expressed the opinion that the antisemitic agitators had been wrong in their belief that a radical antisemitism would unite the most diverse political groups.<sup>71</sup> He concluded that differences regarding political and social questions could not be overcome by simply opposing the Jews and their influence. In fact the early antisemitic movement in Germany had split; the necessary unity of action was never achieved. Moritz Busch's program<sup>72</sup> of forming an antisemitic movement above all religious and political differences remained a pious wish without any chance of realization. But Hitler succeeded in building up a strongly organized movement which used racial antisemitism as the binding ideology. Surely there were other decisively important causes for his success—his charismatic personality which he institutionalized in the leadership principle, his shrewd choice of subordinate leaders, the incompetence of his adversaries and competitors inside and outside the nationalistic camp—but all that does not reduce the role of antisemitism. Why did Hitler win under the banner of the antisemitic credo?

Hitler's credo is most elementary. The Jews are a parasitic and inferior counter race. They exploit and defile; they are incapable of anything positive, for even their unity is a purely external bond imposed upon them by their adversaries; to fight them means to realize the will of God. These pseudo-mythical views were combined with some pseudo-Darwinistic considerations. In the struggle for existence the fittest must win, must subject the weak to his will and exterminate the parasites. Jews are unassimilable aliens, unalterable enemies of all good races. Their aim is world exploitation; the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* must be true because they are opposed by the Jewish press. Jews are communists as well as capitalists, etc. Hitler used a direct, brutal approach, full of hate and contempt. In exploiting instinctive prejudice he won applause by means of coarse and abusive satirical remarks. There is no sophistication and no attempt to appear as a humanitarian, as a well-educated and

<sup>71</sup> Wawrzinek, *op. cit.*, p. 83: "... der Ausgangspunkt des politischen Antisemitismus [war] ein Irrtum, die Gegensätze in allen anderen politischen Fragen liessen sich nicht durch den Antisemitismus überwinden."

<sup>72</sup> Wawrzinek, *op. cit.*, p. 306, who believes that Busch's defense of racial antisemitism was the result of a misunderstanding of Bismarck's wishes. Busch was used as a journalistic mouthpiece by the Iron Chancellor.

detached scholar. Hitler was not inclined to longwinded proofs and to the deciphering of mysterious symbols, which so often made the books and speeches of other antisemites boring. He did not display the dry pseudo-scholarship of a Fritsch, the editor of the *Hammer*. Hitler took the conclusions of this antisemitic literature for granted and was not interested in making a personal contribution to it.

But precisely this direct, elementary racial antisemitism, completely sure of itself, free from all appearance of hesitation and doubt, relieved of all need of proof, gave Adolf Hitler access to the most diverse groups. Unlike Stoecker, Hitler was not a conservative who primarily fought liberalism, socialism, modern secularization as symbolized and represented in and by Jewry. He was a revolutionary who used antisemitism as a potent means of winning adherents, of paralyzing adversaries and of symbolizing his real aims.

Hitler realized that in the period after 1918 racial, radical antisemitism could win both groups, those influenced by the more moderate views of Stoecker as well as those which had remained inaccessible to the orthodox pastor with his opposition to secularism. Walter Frank, the National Socialist biographer of Stoecker, has correctly pointed out that the failure of the court chaplain was primarily the result of his connection with upper-class conservative society.<sup>73</sup> He could not become a radical and win control of the masses. Hitler, of course, was not hampered by the environment of Stoecker. He knew how to exploit the leading conservative and reactionary groups of society, but the élite were now in opposition to the existing political regime. They hated the Weimar Republic and believed that all means of fighting this regime of evil politicians and incompetent upstarts were justified. Hitler's enemies, the defenders of Jews, were pictured simply as defenders of "the anti-German Jew republic." When Hitler's antisemitism seemed to be going too far, it was claimed that such clear, unrestrained language and such an extreme attitude were necessary in a man who dealt with the masses. Hitler himself in *Mein Kampf* satirized those professors and intellectuals who did not realize that only simplification and fanatical onesidedness could win

<sup>73</sup> Frank, *op. cit.*, p. 240: "Dass Stoecker die Herrschaft ueber [die antisemitische Bewegung] nicht hatte behaupten koennen, lag in seiner mangelnden Begabung als Organisator und Parteifuehrer ebenso begruendet wie in der Doppelseitigkeit dieses Lebens, das mit den Maechten des Alten in Kirche und Staat wie auch mit den aus dem Schoss der sozialen Revolution des 19. Jahrhunderts aufsteigenden demokratischen Maechten sich verbunden fuehlte . . ."

the masses.<sup>74</sup> The masses yearned to be dominated and swept away by emotions. They had no appreciation for persuasion and discussion. Thus Hitler's primitive anti-Jewish mythology was not resented by those who saw in him the necessary instrument for the winning of the masses. These conservative haters of the Weimar Republic did not realize that they themselves would become victims of Hitler's unlimited will to power. The Third Reich may be dated as beginning when Hitler could freely use his power, with the antisemitic legislation of April 1933<sup>75</sup> which applied "Aryan" descent as a criterion for participation in public life; it ended in 1944-1945 accompanied by executions of generals and Junkers, who had tried unsuccessfully to prevent Hitler from compelling the German people to follow him into total destruction and staggering defeat.

Hitler's radical antisemitism was in accord with the change in the position of the élite of Imperial Germany after November 1918, i.e., after the collapse of the monarchies. Hitler's "Jewish November criminals" played the role of villains whose evil character could be invoked to explain and to condemn that change. The officer of the imperial regime often did not like the Jews but was not much concerned about them even when he grumbled about aggressive, anti-militaristic Jewish journalists and financial robbers. After the war this officer was deprived of his status; the young officer—who did not get from the republic the generous pension which General Ludendorff and his colleagues received—was faced by a social and economic abyss. Thus antisemitism could become conscious, virulent and aggressive. Who was responsible for everything? The naiveté and weakness of the German leaders prevented them from appraising correctly the alleged perfidy of the Jewish

<sup>74</sup> Hitler, A., *Mein Kampf*, translated by R. Manheim (Boston 1943) p. 180: "All propaganda must be popular and its intellectual level must be adjusted to the most limited intelligence among those it's addressed to . . . the art of propaganda lies in understanding the emotional ideas of the great masses."

<sup>75</sup> Useful though obviously dated is the survey of the antisemitic legislation in Janowsky, Oscar I., *International Aspects of German Racial Policies* (New York 1937) p. 142-228. For the years prior to the outbreak of World War II see Weinryb, B. D., *Jewish Emancipation under Attack*. [Pamphlet series: *Jews and the Post World War II*] (New York 1942) p. 38f.; the impressive but brief survey of Parkes, James, *The Jewish Problem in the Modern World* [London 1939] ch. viii: "The Catastrophe in Germany." Indispensable is Lemkin, R., *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe* (Washington 1944), especially for the application of Nazi antisemitism outside Germany and for the methods of extermination which Lemkin calls "genocide." Among Nazi publications most important was the weekly *Das Schwarze Korps*, published by the SS. It contained the most outspoken statements on the character and methods of Nazi antisemitism. Another indispensable work, which contains a great quantity of new material, is Weinreich, Max, *Hitler's Professors* (New York 1946) ..

"parasites," for whom the defeat of Germany had made accessible positions formerly not open to them. That Hitler had his first successes in Bavaria is a particularly impressive proof of the opposition of the conservative groups to the existing order, the Weimar Republic. The Bavarian conservatives were deeply ashamed of their collapse in the November days. The revolutionary Prime Minister was Kurt Eisner, a Prussian Jew—both antisemitism and traditional anti-Prussianism made of him a convenient scapegoat. The Bavarian conservative bureaucrats, who bear a heavy responsibility for starting Hitler's career, believed—as the behavior of von Kahr demonstrates—that it would be easy to control this uneducated and inexperienced demagogue. Antisemitism was welcome or at least tolerated as a form of protest against the hated new regime.

Another general trend favored Hitler's antisemitism. Formerly, political antisemitism was hampered only by its identification with the radical opposition to the existing regime, anti-nationalist Social Democracy. Now the socialists had gained power; socialist leaders were often members of the cabinets in the Reich as well as in the various *Laender*; trade unions were now recognized as important political and social factors. This caused great resentment among those who were not accustomed to think of socialists and labor leaders as members of the élite. To see a socialist, even a Jewish politician, in a high administrative or government job appeared as something absurd and intolerable to old bureaucrats, middle-class people and officers. They acclaimed the cartoon depicting socialist ministers in bathing trunks, distributed in 1919, as a symbol of the despised and hated republican regime. To attack President Ebert because he had been a saddler and his wife a maid, became a kind of pastime in society circles. Antisemitism was the form in which radical negation of the existing order could be most easily expressed by groups which had no revolutionary tradition. Antisemitism appeared as a negation of the republic and aimed at the restoration of the old regime with some improvements which would exclude the influence of anti-German forces—e.g., of the various anti-nationalist parties—and of Jews, thus making another national collapse impossible.

At the same time antisemitism could attract those interested in radical social changes. The Jews were decried as the symbol of the inflation and depression which had destroyed the status of many of the middle class. The Jews were—to adopt the terminology so successfully used by National Socialist agitators—the representatives of exploiting, parasitic,

finance capitalism which was utterly opposed to the productive capitalist system, wherein the creative entrepreneurs and leaders of industries organize production and apply new methods for the benefit of the whole people. Some scandals (Kutisker, Barmat), in which Jews played a role and which were over-emphasized by skillful propaganda,—not only in the Nazi press but in all anti-republican papers—helped to popularize this distinction. Jews became symbols of the speculation and the easy way of moneymaking, which developed during the inflation. The fact that some Jews from the East had, during the inflation, bought houses cheaply and then moved away from Berlin after the stabilization of the mark, abandoning their property, was seen as characteristic of Jewish destructive influence in economic life.

Anticapitalism was now taken seriously as a form of antisemitism. That was very harmful to the socialists. They appeared as allies of capitalism, not only because they supported the republican regime in power, which was accused of favoring capitalist exploitation, but also because they were opposed to antisemitism. Before World War I antisemitism had served as a weapon of social criticism only for limited groups, e.g., the peasants in Hesse who claimed to suffer from Jewish usury, or restricted middle-class groups who voted for one of the antisemitic parties. The collapse of traditional political institutions, the emergence of men of humble background, who sometimes wore ill-fitting top-hats and striped trousers, in the place of the Kaiser with his impressive uniform and glamorous companions, and particularly the insecurity experienced during the inflation period, all these transformed antisemitism from a parochial into a national affair.

Why did communist propaganda, directed against the Weimar Republic and the socialists, fail to win the proletarianized middle class, the peasants suffering from low prices, the officers resentful of their new and none too lucrative jobs? Communist propaganda had but a limited appeal. It was able only to win a group of workers who, according to the communists, would be the leading class, destined to shape the future society, and some intellectuals who loved paradoxical, complicated constructions as, e.g., "National Bolshevism," or who satirized the petty-bourgeois outlook of the democratic labor leaders. Peasants and middle-class men were more responsive to an appeal which promised the restoration of the traditional past, securely prosperous, and were convinced by the antisemitic explanation of Germany's insecurity and the crisis. In

addition, the communists were linked with Russia, whereas most Germans were not fascinated by Russian literature and religion, as were some sophisticated intellectuals; they considered the Russians an inferior people now under Jewish domination. By contrast, antisemitic nationalism seemed something natural and acceptable, even though many who voted the National Socialist ticket did not take it very seriously. They considered their vote simply as a protest vote signifying their abandonment of the old moderate liberal leaders, who, having accomplished nothing, would have to be replaced by new ones.

### *The Social Basis of Hitler's Antisemitism*

Hitler's antisemitism was—as we have tried to show—in no way original. His philosopher was Rosenberg, whose *Myth of the 20th Century* was a rehash of Chamberlain's *Foundations* by a man with no education. Rosenberg, in spite of his wide reading, had remained an ignoramus, oversimplifying everything and compensating for his deficiencies by a monomaniacal fanaticism. The works of the National-Socialist expert on racism, H. Guenther, were more accurate in the presentation of fact but his interpretations were dictated by a love for the fantastic Nordic race, to which everything good was ascribed, in contrast to the "mongrel" Jews, in whom nothing but evil inhered. Hitler was decisively influenced by Schoenerer who had used antisemitism as a means of intensifying German nationalism. But Hitler was too skillful a propagandist to repeat the error committed by Schoenerer and General Ludendorff: he did not attack many enemies at the same time. It is noteworthy that in *Mein Kampf* Hitler criticized Schoenerer (also aiming, of course, at the Prussian general) for his open war against the Catholic Church.

It was thus not just by chance that the survivors and successors of the older antisemitic groups either joined Hitler or were swept away by his movement. He could, on the one hand, successfully use for his purposes crackpots such as Dinter, who was the author of a ludicrous best-seller, *Sin Against the Blood*, devoted to the exposure of the diabolical, systematic sexual attack of the Jews directed against the "Aryan race;" Dinter, however, became the leader of an "Aryan" spiritual religion, broke with National Socialism and was soon forgotten. Hitler was also able to attract to his party ruthless demagogues without any general political program, such as Knueppel-Kunze, who once won enough votes to elect three of his followers to the Reichstag, an achievement made



possible only by the system of proportional representation. But if Hitler's ideology was not different—at the beginning of his public career, when he himself had probably not yet realized the possibilities and the future extent of his success—from the old-fashioned racial antisemitism, the social basis of his movement was much broader than that of his forerunners. This success was due to the rise of a new nationalism which Hitler exploited. Nationalism had been kept within bounds during the Reich of Bismarck, but these effective checks disappeared under the Weimar Republic. The transformation of a liberal into a totalitarian nationalism, appealing to the masses and uniting them under the leadership of Hitler, was accomplished under the banner of antisemitism.

Bismarck was a most skillful exploiter of the nationalism which expressed the longing, particularly of German intellectuals and businessmen, for German political unity. His Reich did not embrace all German-speaking groups. As a result he was greatly embarrassed by Schoenerer's pro-Hohenzollern and anti-Habsburg agitation, whose nationalistic mass base was unintelligible to him. Bismarck was also very anxious not to offend Russia by displaying a deep interest in the affairs of the Baltic Germans. German nationalism was checked by the Prussian tradition, which considered that the basic elements of political unity were the bureaucracy and the army under the control of the monarch. The bureaucracy was inclined to follow established rules and the monarchs felt themselves bound by constitutions. Though leading German statesmen, as well as outstanding representatives of German learning, regarded parliamentary government as anti-German, constitutionalism was generally accepted, even by Bismarck himself, who, however, was always eager to remain independent of parliamentary majorities, to be the master manipulating the representative bodies according to his wishes. Another check was the liberalism of the majority of the educated world, of the "national," bourgeois, non-socialist parties. This liberalism, it is true, lost more and more of its universalist-humanitarian character. Symbolic of this development was the tragedy of the 100-day reign of the sincerely liberal Frederick III. The pan-Germans, eager to win "a place in the sun" for Germany, to make her a naval and colonial world power, were recruited from professors and businessmen, traditionally liberal. But these nationalists, who sought to imitate British imperialism and dreamed of Germany's mission to master the yellow and colored races and the inferior Slavs, were opposed to mass rule. They believed in the necessity

of ruling the masses. In applying pseudo-Darwinian ideas, they played with racialism but it did not occur to them that it would be possible to create a totalitarian state on the basis of racial mythology. The pan-Germans did not attempt to stir up mass emotions and to manipulate them. Their efforts were devoted to winning the élite and to influencing those in power, often by campaigns of denunciation and by intrigues, as that directed, e.g., against Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg during World War I.

Hitler and his friends, of course, were masters of intrigue and of exploiting social connections. But the decisive cause of Hitler's success was that, unlike the pan-Germans, he understood the importance of the masses in nationalistic agitation, and that, unlike Stoecker, he knew how to organize them. He may be characterized as the pan-German mass leader, whereas the old pan-Germans addressed themselves only to the ruling and social élite. Hitler's appeal to the masses took the form of antisemitic mythology.

This mythology, in contrast to the parochial appeals of the earlier antisemitic demagogues and sectarians, corresponded to general needs and trends. Germany had been defeated—but by the universal enemy who had been able to exploit the naiveté of the innocent Germans. The Jew, the Elder of Zion, was not only the enemy of Germany, but of mankind. It was precisely in bad times that he prospered. The recovery of the period of Locarno was only a provisional one, a mask behind which the Jew would soon reappear. This mythology was very simple. Certain "facts" were used as starting points,—Jewish exploiters of the inflation, the increase of Jewish officials, the influx of Jewish refugees from the East. At the same time it presented an easy "explanation": not the visible reality mattered but the mysterious determining forces. This mythology appealed to quite diverse social groups: to reactionaries who hated the new regime; to intellectuals impatient with moderate utilitarian policies; to students in vain search of jobs; to middle-class men and peasants, who did not understand why the economic machinery, in spite of all their labors, was breaking down; to crackpots who sought new German beliefs; and to Christians horrified by secularization, eccentric arts, public immorality, etc. It was, moreover, most important that this antisemitic mythology could be presented as the only program capable of destroying the bolshevik threat and of creating a strong united Germany, which would fulfill a world mission. The Jew in his dual role

as bolshevik and capitalist was the devil; the fight against him kept the most varied groups together. Jewish domination explained all defeats and economic crises. Hatred of the Jew brought freedom from the necessity of complex rational analyses and painful reflection, as well as from the necessity of searching for personal faults and responsibilities.

The antisemitic mythology intensified the hysteria which made possible the enthusiastic submission of the masses to a new élite, apparently untainted by the weaknesses of the old order of gullibility and compromises. This hysteria expressed itself in a fanatical belief in the ability of these new leaders to build up the New Reich, a belief at once pseudo-religious and pseudo-scientific. Hitler's unification of the German people would correspond to the "scientific" racial laws, whose clearest negative expression was the definition of the Jews as the counter race, as the men of evil and poisonous blood. A conservatism disappointed by the victory of the democratic parties over the traditionally ruling élite could be swept away by this mythology, apparently so precise and at the same time so ambiguous. Before it communist propaganda appeared helpless and merely as its useful, involuntary justification. The antisemitic mythology of Hitler seemed to be an appeal to fight for traditional values—people, religion, and what the Nazi party called positive Christianity,—to which Hitler made his first appeal after his appointment as Chancellor. Communism, on the other hand, was opposed to all tradition and could be successful only among those who were either completely uprooted and believed in a rationalist utopia of a perfectly rational world, or who were heirs of the old Marxist tradition and education.

What had been impossible before Germany's defeat in 1918 and the collapse of its institutions, and before social and economic insecurity had become a universal threat during the years of inflation, was now possible: the creation of a nationalist movement based upon the hate of the Jew as the symbol and incarnation of all evil forces and trends of decay. The masses disappointed by the moderate parties, youth despising the complicated discussions of tacticians who seemed to be cowards, fearful of all responsibilities and decisions, unpolitical elements, attracted by showmanship and a display of strength and the will to power, were in no way shocked by the crudest antisemitic agitation. They enjoyed the sensational story that a Jewish chain restaurant in Cologne had served—and to a popular sports hero—a dead mouse in a dish of meat stew; they were amused by the campaigns of Dr. Goebbels against "Loidor," as he

called the Berlin police vice-president, Dr. Weiss; they admired that ascetic vegetarian, Hitler, the son of the people, the unknown soldier, who dared to act not only against socialist and democratic officials, but also against rotten reactionaries who had dealings with Jews and, fearful of Jewish money and social connections, did not become antisemites.

On the other hand, many sophisticated intellectuals and conservatives, who disliked obvious coarseness and brutality, believed (or persuaded themselves to believe) that Hitler's mythology was merely a Machiavelian game necessary to win the masses. Once they destroyed the Weimar Republic, they believed, the Nazis would adapt themselves to realities. Chancellor Hitler with his ruthless antisemitism would not rule; the real power would be in the hands of such men as Vice Chancellor von Papen and Minister of Economy, General Director Hugenberg. Curiously enough, this belief was shared by the moderate parties. They could not believe that even if Nazi mythology would carry the election, it would determine state policy. They saw in Hitler not the introducer of the techniques and policies of the mass-age into German life but simply a party leader among other party leaders, possibly a more skillful demagogue but not a revolutionary who would make antisemitism a basic force both at home and in world politics.

### *From the "Aryan Paragraph" to Extermination*

Immediately upon his accession to political power Hitler was forced into a difficult tactical course. He had to appear as a reasonable, moderate man and at the same time not lose the confidence of those among his followers who looked for a complete change of political and social conditions and would not be satisfied with the substitution of a somewhat modernized imperial regime for the Weimar Republic. These apparently incompatible requirements also determined his tactics in carrying out his antisemitic program. Those who expected that a "night of long knives" against Jews would follow his appointment as chancellor proved to be wrong. Legality was emphasized. At first the new government did not berate the Jews or call for antisemitic legislation. Jewish-owned newspapers believed that if they were careful they would be able to survive the regime; for the first press ordinance of Hitler's cabinet permitted a swift recourse to the courts, which sometimes reversed the official suppression of a publication. The electoral campaign for the Reichstag involved some violence against the Jews; the Reichstag fire

provided another occasion for violence by Stormtroopers and the SS, against whom the police at first did not dare and soon was unwilling to act. Only after the new Reichstag was elected and after the necessary two-thirds majority for the enabling law was secured by the exclusion of the communists, were the antisemitic governmental policies initiated. To make them appear to be a response to popular demands, a Jewish boycott, a voluntary affair in theory only, was organized by the party. The cabinet, dominated by Hitler, then issued the first antisemitic legislation. "Non-Aryans," with the exception of office-holders whose tenure antedated 1914 and of active participants in World War I, lost their civil service jobs. This measure was soon extended to the professions (lawyers, physicians, etc.). Racial criteria were applied: a "non-Aryan" was a person who had one grandparent of Jewish descent, generally to be determined by religion. This legislation was advanced by official propaganda as a purely defensive measure. Hitler in an interview made the astonishing and, of course, false statement that a majority of civil servants were Jews. The details of the legislation which followed this first antisemitic law are not of very general interest. Their aim was obvious: to exclude for all time as many "non-Aryans" as possible from public life, from the professions and from any influence on artistic and cultural life. Dr. Goebbels' *Kulturhammer*, with its compulsory membership, did not accept "non-Aryans." The pretext for the April boycott was the Jewish emigrants. Inasmuch as these emigrants had attacked the Third Reich, the need of self-defense brought forth, as Dr. Goebbels explained, the anti-Jewish laws. In this first period, however, no official general economic war against the Jews was conducted. True, under pressure important Jewish enterprises were sold at nominal prices and Jews were barred from dealing with government and municipal agencies, but in the early years, and particularly while General Director Schmitt was Minister of Economy (1933-34), official spokesmen asserted that Jewish business would be tolerated. Even more remarkable is the fact that there was no cancellation of the political rights of native Jewish citizens. Only the naturalization of "non-Aryans" was cancelled, incidentally revealing that the stories of mass-naturalization of East-European Jews were not true.

All this changed in 1935 with the Nuremberg legislation. The Jews were thereby deprived of citizenship and were reduced to the status of subjects; marriage and sexual intercourse between Jews and "Aryans" were forbidden. Jews were not allowed to employ an "Aryan" woman

under 40 years of age as servant. This legislation, preceded by a publicity campaign against alleged Jewish sexual criminals, was presented as a last attempt to secure peaceful relations between Germans and Jews. The threat was made that if the Jews did not behave, the party would take over.

National Socialist antisemitism, not content with the fulfillment of the party program, went further. A campaign was begun to bar Jews and other "non-Aryans"—in some cases the criterion of the Jewish grandparent was waived—from all professions and business life. The assassination of a secretary of the German embassy in Paris, vom Rath, was the pretext, not only for party-organized pogroms, burning of synagogues and mass arrests, but for the completion of the anti-Jewish legislation. Jews were excluded from schools. They were not allowed to have shops. They had to pay a heavy "fine." Ghettos were established and Jews were not allowed to enter certain parts of Berlin. Previously restricted to the use of a few marked benches in the parks, they were now completely excluded from parks as well as from museums, libraries and theaters. The Jews had to accept special names, which seemed—at least to the Nazi officials—particularly ugly and grotesque. Everything was prepared for the beginning of the policy of extermination, which was put into effect after 1941. After the conquest of Poland in October 1939 Jews were sent to the environs of Lublin. After 1941 they were sent to extermination centers, where they were killed if they were judged unable to do hard work under particularly severe conditions. They received starvation wages and had no rights under social welfare legislation, etc. But a certain distinction appears to have been made between non-German and German Jews for some German Jews were sent to Theresienstadt, where a few of them managed to survive the harsh conditions.

The antisemitic policy of Hitler logically fulfilled itself in this policy of total extermination, a policy for which there had been warnings in public statements by Hitler that the Jews must disappear from Europe. The alleged necessity of defending the Germans against Jewish preponderance in the civil service, law and the professions soon became a policy of complete exclusion, and finally the Jews were deprived even of the primary human right, of the right to live. If the Jews could not be used for hard labor, or occasionally for skills which could not be found elsewhere, they were regarded as parasites and exterminated as cheaply as possible. The costs of the gas-chambers were covered by taking away their clothing, collecting their wedding rings, gold teeth, etc. Sometimes

the ashes were used as fertilizer. Duehring's program had become a reality in a form which even that monomaniacal hater of the Jews as the anti-natural race had not imagined.

But why was this culmination of total antisemitism reached only gradually? There were some elements in the German people who had to be taken into consideration; many conservatives would not have accepted extermination camps in 1933; therefore some concessions to their feelings, e.g., exemption of "non-Aryan" war veterans, were necessary. But as the regime became stronger its ruthlessness grew. Strange as it seems, Hitler and his friends apparently believed the fantastic stories of a tremendous Jewish world power, and therefore went ahead cautiously. Some apparent concessions, such as abandonment of the boycott in 1933 after one day, were useful in misleading politicians who were unable to realize that a ruthless policy could be carried out in installments. Besides, the Jew could be used as *the* enemy of the Third Reich. All Germans formed the "community of the people," and this community was held together by hatred of the diabolical Jew, the eternal enemy. The Jew was the figure outside that community, eternally plotting its destruction. He was the eternal scapegoat. Whereas all other enemies were—as a National-Socialist pamphlet put it—only temporary enemies, the Jew was always the foe, the inveterate and unchangeable hater of the German "people's community."

The "eternal Jew" was not only a scapegoat for the diversion of emotions; the Jews were made responsible for unemployment, the scarcity of jobs for intellectuals, economic failures, the "encirclement" of Germany and the spread of hatred for Germany throughout the world; the Jew prospered in periods of misery. He also served as the mythical counterpart of the German "people's community" under the leadership of Hitler and the Nazi hierarchy. Alexander Stein has correctly pointed out in his book on the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" that the Nazis practised the very methods they ascribed to the world-masters of their fantasy. The combination of racialism with the same belief in themselves as the chosen people, attributed by the Nazis to the Jews—the most vulgar anti-semitic propagandist, Julius Streicher, used to quote some sentences from the Old Testament in support of racialism—was used by the Nazis to build up their concept of the master race: the good race ought to dominate the world whereas the evil race or the evil mixture of bad races, was destined to be defeated. Even after the Jew had disappeared from public

life the antisemitic myth continued to work successfully. World Jewry was not yet defeated. It had been infuriated and would try by all means, especially by stirring up another war, to destroy the healthy German "people's community" and the European "new order" of the Third Reich.

The "Eternal Jew" could also be used for political and social experiments and, on the broadest scale, for "educational" purposes.<sup>76</sup> The principle of extermination of parasitic people could be applied against him; the "master" instincts and the inhuman attitude required of the rulers could be produced and cultivated in the concentration and extermination camps with their horrors. The myth of the evil, parasitic "eternal Jew" was the clearest expression that there was no unity of mankind. The Nazi doctrine that the lowest human racial group is closer to the animal than to the "higher" human race, is most easily demonstrated by the behavior of the SS and other "élite" elements toward those destined to be exterminated, chiefly Jews.

Another motive for the continuation and intensification of anti-semitism even after the alleged Jewish predominance in some fields of public life had been completely reversed, was the desire to replace Jews with Germans as leading groups, particularly in Eastern Europe. P. H. Seraphim, who became the "scientific" apologist for the complete expulsion of the Jews from Europe,—a program, which could be (and was) easily "perfected" into a program of extermination—observed in his study on Eastern Jewry that the Eastern Slavic peoples, because of their backwardness, require the Jew as an important economic element.<sup>77</sup> The extermination of the Jew, after he had been worked almost to death or after his usefulness as artisan or skilled worker had ended, was designed to make room for the German élite in Eastern Europe. These would not need Jewish middlemen; they could dominate and exploit directly. The extermination of the Jews would even be accepted with enthusiasm, or at least not be opposed by some "natives," who regarded the Jews as ex-

<sup>76</sup> Taylor, A. J. P., *The Course of German History* (London 1945) remarks: "The Jews became the helpless objects on which millions of Germans first exercised the brutality essential if Germany was to dominate Europe."

<sup>77</sup> Seraphim, Peter H., *Das Judentum im osteuropäischen Raum* (Essen 1938). Prof. Seraphim developed his program of expulsion of all Jews from Europe in *Weltkampf. Die Judenfrage in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (April-September 1941). This periodical was edited as *Wissenschaftliche Vierteljahrsschrift des Instituts zur Erforschung des Judentums* by W. Grau. It is obvious that the program of Seraphim was destined to prepare the mass extermination of the Jews.



ploiters, as responsible for all social evils.<sup>78</sup> Thus the extermination of the Jews, particularly in Eastern Europe, was also destined to win sympathizers for German domination.

*Nazi Antisemitism in International Politics*

The analysis of the extermination policy demonstrates the error of those who ascribe the intensification of antisemitism in the Third Reich exclusively to an individual pathological complex of Hitler and of his friends. The extermination and its unspeakable cruelties were certainly a source of pleasure for the antisemitic sadists. These pleasures increased as the victims became more and more helpless, more and more objects to be completely humiliated, defiled and debased. But these actions of extermination and torture also served the most important political purposes. Their role was of central importance not only for the inner German aspect of the Nazi regime. The Nazis used antisemitism as a powerful weapon in the fight for world domination, and Hannah Arendt is not alone in her belief that international antisemitism, as developed by the Nazis, has not yet become an affair of the past.<sup>79</sup>

Antisemitism on an international scale, of course, existed before Hitler came into power. At the height of Stoecker's activities antisemitic international conferences were called together. Chamberlain subtly characterized the Jew as the enemy of the productive Germanic peoples and their civilization; Christian conservatives regretted and opposed anti-traditional, secularized Judaism as a menace to Christian peoples and their tradition. The rise of bolshevism after World War I contributed to the fear of a world revolution under Jewish leadership—the fact that the Jewish middle class was most severely hurt by the bolshevik economic policy was overlooked. Instead it was emphasized that there were Jews among the bolshevik leaders in Russia and in Hungary. This was done not only by professional antisemites but even in diplomatic dispatches. Formerly, only ultra-conservative circles had feared an alliance of Jewish

<sup>78</sup> Seton-Watson, H., *Eastern Europe between the Wars, 1918-41* (Cambridge, England 1945) writes (p. 384g.): "A weapon of German diplomacy was antisemitism. . . . Nazi persecution of the Jews served not only to find a scapegoat for popular discontent within Germany, but to win the Third Reich popularity abroad. The young men of the Rumanian-Hungarian and Polish bourgeoisies . . . came to regard Germany as a Promised Land of social justice, fighting for the rights of the oppressed victims of the World Jewish Plot."

<sup>79</sup> Arendt, Hannah, "The Seeds of a Fascist International," in *Jewish Frontier* (June 1945).

money-power and revolutionary movements, but after World War I this fear was shared by circles that had been progressive and liberal.

The organization and open promotion of antisemitic feelings in the pre-World War I period was effectively prevented by the fact that anti-semitism appeared to be connected with the Tsarist government (which did not have any particular prestige), with rotten Rumania, or, as in France, with occasionally intelligent but often eccentric reactionaries, who allied themselves with the mob during the Dreyfus affair. The existence of antisemitic parties in Germany was seen as one of the proofs of the backwardness of German political life. But after World War I the situation changed. There was not only the fear of "Jewish" bolshevism, but there was also a rising disappointment with the progressive democratic order established by the outcome of the war. This situation permitted the Nazis to use antisemitism systematically on the international scene. This is overlooked by those who overestimate the value of public condemnation of antisemitism and are surprised to discover how Nazi antisemitism was able to exploit moderate and unconscious forms of antisemitism for its purposes.

The government and the ruling party of the Third Reich supported and organized antisemitic propaganda centers; literature was spread by the Fichte Gesellschaft and by the Erfurt *Welt Dienst*.<sup>80</sup> These activities skillfully fostered and exploited the belief that any opposition to the Third Reich of Adolf Hitler was dictated by Jewish interests. Why should Nazism have aroused opposition to Germany abroad? Were not the Versailles Treaty and the harsh treatment of the German people responsible for the Nazis? Would not the bad features of Nazism, such as the scurrilous antisemitism of Hitler, be removed in the long run? Were these evil aspects not compensated for by such achievements as the disappearance of unemployment and the rise of a new enthusiastic belief after years of despair and hopelessness? Nazi antisemitism, though publicly condemned and deplored, helped to paralyze energetic action against

<sup>80</sup> A survey of National Socialist "scientific" antisemitic activities is to be found in *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, vol. 5 (Hamburg 1941). Walter Frank and Wilhelm Grau, who originally co-operated in starting the Nazi research on Jews, later quarrelled bitterly. Grau joined the Institut zur Erforschung des Judentums, opposed to Frank's Reichsinstitut fuer Geschichte des Neuen Deutschland. W. Frank, the author of the Stoecker biography, in his survey of antisemitic research attacks a publication of Grau . . . as too clerical, but he himself appointed Grau after this publication as executive secretary for the research on Jews to be organized by his Reichsinstitut. On the relations between Grau and Frank cf. Weinreich, *op. cit.*, 53 f., 101 ff.

the Nazi regime. After all, not only the English conservatives believed that the Jews had too much power and wealth in Republican Germany. In the eyes of many non-German observers Nazi antisemitism was an extreme and unjust but understandable reaction which would soon give way to a more reasonable attitude. The paralyzing effect of Nazi antisemitism—visible even among some statesmen of Jewish origin, who were anxious to appear as “objective” as possible—increased when Hitler openly started to exploit the fear of war. The Jews were pictured more and more not only as communists but as warmongers. The Jews had been accused of trying by all means to prevent the rise of a “people’s community” in Germany; for, as Nazi propaganda shouted, the Jew realized that the unification of the German people would deny him the opportunity of thriving as a parasite on party strife and class struggle. Now this propaganda scheme was applied to the international scene. Only the Jews and their conscious and unconscious tools were against Germany and therefore for war. Statesmen and public figures disliked by Nazis were declared to be Jews—President Roosevelt was made the scion of a Jewish family, and Pope Pius XI, who opposed racialism, was also pictured as of Jewish origin.

It would be wrong to measure the success of this antisemitic propaganda by its visible consequences. Neither the rise and increase of antisemitic movements, as e.g., of the Iron Guard in Rumania, nor the introduction of racist legislation into Italy by the same Mussolini who, in his interviews with Emil Ludwig, had satirized antisemitism and expressed contempt for it, were as important as the creation of an atmosphere. Such avowed allies and tools as Quisling were far less useful for Hitler, than those men who sincerely rejected his barbarous policies, but who refused, as they put it, to plunge the world into chaos for the rescue or revenge of the Jews. Underestimating Hitler, they waited until the war they had tried at all costs to avoid, had become a reality. Pacifism and the acceptance of Hitler’s anti-communism were powerful factors in shaping this mentality of appeasement, but the overconscious emphasis upon the influence of the Jews cultivated by Hitler’s antisemitic policies was not the least important among them.

An energetic policy against Hitler appeared as a policy likely to plunge the world into a new world war in the interest of the Jews and it was added that such a world catastrophe would not help the Jews. Hitler himself, obviously making use of this outlook, announced that another

war would end with the destruction of the Jews in Europe. Antisemitism became a poison that intensified the pacifist attitude which, surely against the will of many of its leading representatives, allowed Hitler time for rearmament and enabled him to appear as a man crying for justice to Germany by removal of the injustices of Versailles. Antisemitism was not justified, but seemed psychologically understandable, as the evil product of deep underlying causes, particularly of the unjust treatment of Germany. In this way an energetic policy against Hitler seemed to be in reality shortsighted; such a policy could be useful only to Hitler, who could accuse the Jews of trying to disturb the peace of the world. Particularly Jewish grievances ought not determine the fundamental line of national policies.

Hitler's antisemitism managed to bring about appeasement policies abroad before Nazi legislation and extermination methods could become an article of export to countries which either were glad to imitate Germany or needed to win the goodwill of the Third Reich or were conquered and administered by direct and indirect methods. This "exported" antisemitism often boomeranged. There have been individuals even in Germany who disliked the elimination and extermination policies practiced against the Jews. Some authorities of church and society who could not or did not speak out publicly opposed these inhuman actions. Individual Jews and "non-Aryans" were rescued by these silent opponents of racial and inhuman antisemitism. Such practical, though politically powerless, opposition against the persecution of the Jews spread widely, particularly in those countries where, as in the Netherlands, in Italy, or in many French circles, the imported antisemitism appeared as a symbol of Nazi conquest and aroused feelings of Christian and human charity and solidarity.<sup>81</sup>

For this reason Hitler's antisemitic world campaign was not a complete success. As the extent and the methods of extermination became known in an irrefutable way after the Allied conquest of Germany, even those who had been rather neutral towards Nazi antisemitism were pro-

<sup>81</sup> Koppel S. Pinson writes: "... this much is undisputed fact: never has the papacy spoken in such unmistakable terms against racialism and antisemitism as in the words and deeds of the present pope, Pius XII, and his predecessor, Pius XI. In papal encyclicals and in public speeches these two pontiffs have unequivocally denounced antisemitism as dangerous and unchristian . . . Many a Jewish life was saved by priests and nuns who followed the example set by Pius XII towards the persecuted Jews." "Antisemitism in the Post-War World," in *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. vii (1945) 103.

foundly shocked and revolted. But this should not lead us to ignore the effectiveness of Hitler's use of antisemitism as a weapon of social revolution and disintegration. Because an avowedly antisemitic party—the Tsarist regime at its worst did not pretend to be based upon antisemitism—was ruling powerful and respected Germany, anti-capitalist criticism everywhere could become at the same time an antisemitic movement. The antisemitic International was no longer an affair of some politicians without real influence or of some eccentric or barbarous crackpots, who saw Jewish Masons as world-masters and spent their money for the publication of the antisemitic encyclopedia, *Sigilla Veri*. Now antisemitic anti-capitalism could replace international “Jewish” socialism and communism; the fear of bolshevism could be combined—and not by parochial movements alone, which would influence only backward countries like Rumania—with criticism of the wealthy and of the existing property distribution. Antisemitism now appeared not only as a weapon against bolshevism, but also as the basis of a real attempt to create a new social order, to increase political power, to found strong governments not hampered by Jewish gold and the alleged Jewish control of public opinion. The Jewish Devil could be used, on the one hand, to explain to those in privileged positions the threat of the masses and, on the other, to show the masses who was their real enemy—the Jew with his allies and servants. Hitler and his antisemitism appeared as the salvation of the conservative world as well as the great anti-plutocratic revolution.

### Conclusion

Antisemitism in modern Germany began as a vague criticism directed against Jewish assimilation; acceptance of the Christian religion (by conservatives) or complete submersion of the Jews in humanity and in the fight for a classless society (by non- and anti-Christian thinkers) was expected. The extent and the reality of assimilation were questioned, on Christian conservative grounds, as by Stoecker; on nationalist grounds, as by Treitschke, the opponent of Eastern Jewish immigration. The possibility of assimilation was completely denied by those who accepted racialism, whether in crude or more sophisticated forms (Duehring and Chamberlain). Antisemitism became an organized but parochial political movement which appealed to middle-class and traditionalist groups suffering from economic conditions. But during the empire of the Kaisers antisemitism did not become a political power. It was influential only in a

covert, behind-the-scenes fashion in the form of the tacit exclusion of Jews from many leading positions or it was expressed by a cultural criticism directed against their spirit. The apparent replacement of the politically dominant classes after the loss of the war and the rise of the republic, the increasing and chronic social insecurity, which threatened not only the middle class and peasants but reduced the chances of intellectuals, professional men, students of law, medicine, etc., the coming of the socialists into power and their difficulty in maintaining and winning the adherence of discontented groups, the longing for simple explanations of the confused world and the breakdown of the traditional, national order—such are the factors without which Nazi antisemitism would have had no success. Antisemitism is the negative expression of the charismatic belief in *the* leader—Hitler, the man sent by God to fight the diabolical Jew. Antisemitism made the vague internal and foreign policies of the Nazis appear clear and definite.

Antisemitism is the expression of the change from liberal-democratic nationalism, opposing super-or non-national government and traditional ruling classes, to the totalitarian variety, opposing liberalism, individual liberty and the freely expressed consent of the people, the multiplicity of parties and public discussion. Under the totalitarian regime the will of the *one* charismatic leader and his henchmen is the will of the people. The Jews are not only outcasts necessarily apart from the people; they are used to concentrate feelings of hatred; they prevent peace and order; they are proofs of the necessity of domination and subjugation. Antisemitism exploits conservative-traditionalist attitudes and corresponds to modern secularization: the race is a "scientific" and at the same time mythical basis. German nationalism combined with antisemitism opposes itself first, to Western democratic-liberal ideas, victorious in Germany only after a humiliating national defeat; secondly, to international bolshevism, which allegedly threatened to submerge the whole world, thus giving its German enemy a chance to pose as a world redeemer; thirdly, to capitalistic imperialism, which had divided the world before the coming of Germany's hour, when Germany would impose the natural racial "new order." Nazi antisemitism filled the vacuum which was created by the collapse of the imperial regime and the lack of self-confidence of the republican and democratic groups. Antisemitism appeared as the myth which helped to unify the "people's community" and to permit the exploitation of divergences as well as of internal weaknesses among those

who were made responsible for the world of Versailles. Upon them Nazi Germany intended to impose a super-Versailles, bringing the true German world peace which, for Hitler, was domination of the world by Germany, in turn dominated by him and his henchmen.





## THE CONTRIBUTORS

HANNAH ARENDT teaches in the history department of Brooklyn College and is a member of the research staff of the Commission on European Jewish Cultural Reconstruction. During 1933-1941 she was engaged in social work in France. Her publications include *Die Liebesbegriff bei Augustin* and numerous studies and essays in *Jewish Social Studies*, *Menorah Journal*, *Commentary*, *Review of Politics* and other journals.

ZEVI DIESENDRUCK, who died in 1940, served as professor of Jewish philosophy at the Hebrew Union College for ten years. His extensive writings and translations included both Hebrew essays of literary value and contributions to the understanding of Plato and Maimonides. His posthumous life-work on the philosophy of Maimonides is being edited for publication.

SOLOMON GRAYZEL is teacher of history at Gratz College (Philadelphia) and editor of the Jewish Publication Society of America. He is the author of *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century* (Philadelphia 1933) and is a contributor to the *Jewish Quarterly Review* and *Historia Judaica*.

WALDEMAR GURIAN received his doctorate at the University of Cologne and taught in the Berlin Hochschule für Politik in 1931-32. In 1937 he joined the faculty of the University of Notre Dame, where he is professor of political science. He is editor of the *Review of Politics* and has published the following works in English: *Bolshevism, Theory and Practice*; *Hitler and the Christians*; *The Future of Bolshevism*; *The Rise and Decline of Marxism*.

GUIDO KISCH is a native of Prague, where he served on the bench at the County Court of Appeals until 1915. He served later as professor of law at the universities of Leipzig, Königsberg, Halle and Prague. After his dismissal by the Nazi government in 1933 he was professor of Jewish history at the Jewish Theological Seminary in Breslau and since 1937 he is professor of Jewish history at the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York City. He is a fellow of the American Academy for Jewish Research and editor of *Historia Judaica*. He is at present editing a one-volume encyclopedia entitled *The Jews*.

RAPHAEL MAHLER is a native of Galicia and was graduated from the University of Vienna in 1922. He was teacher of history in the Jewish

college, Ascola, in Warsaw. His scientific work in the field of Jewish history was carried on mainly in connection with the activities of the Yiddish Scientific Institute in Vilna. He was editor of *Yunger historiher* and *Bleter far geshichte*, publications issued by the Yivo. He has contributed numerous articles to the *Encyclopädia Judaica*, *Yivo Bleter*, *Jewish Social Studies* and other scholarly and popular journals. At present he is lecturer at the Jewish Teachers' Seminary of the Jewish National Workers' Alliance in New York City. His work in Yiddish on *The Struggle between Haskalah and Hasidism in Galicia* appeared in 1942.

JACOB RADER MARCUS received his doctorate at the University of Berlin and is also a graduate of the Hebrew Union College, where he is professor of Jewish history since 1934. Among his publications are *The Rise and Destiny of the German Jew* (1934) and *The Jew in the Medieval World* (1938).

RALPH MARCUS is professor of Hellenistic Civilization at the University of Chicago. He is a consulting editor of *Webster's International Dictionary*; a member of the Editorial Board of the *Review of Religion*; a fellow of the American Academy for Jewish Research; author of *Law in the Apocrypha*, editions and translations of several volumes of Josephus and Philo (in press) in the Loeb Classical Library, and of a number of articles on Biblical history, religion and philology in various learned periodicals.

KOPPEL S. PINSON is Associate Professor of History at Queens College and Executive Editor of *Jewish Social Studies*. He was one of the editors of the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* and is author of *Pietism and the Rise of German Nationalism* (1934), *A Bibliographical Introduction to Nationalism* (1935), *The Third Reich*, with Henri Lichtenberger (1937) and numerous articles in learned periodicals as well as the article "Antisemitism" in the latest edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

JOSEPH REIDER received his doctorate at Dropsie College, Philadelphia, where he is professor of Biblical philology and librarian since 1913. He is author of *Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila* (1916), a *Commentary on Deuteronomy* (1937) and numerous articles.

SAMUEL ROSENBLATT is a graduate of The City College of New York and received his Ph.D. degree from Columbia in 1927. He was also graduated from the Jewish Theological Seminary in 1925. He was Hazard Fellow in the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem in 1925-26 and Rayner Fellow in Semitic Languages at Johns Hopkins Uni-

versity in 1928-30. He is rabbi of the Beth Tfiloh Congregation in Baltimore since 1927 and lecturer on Jewish literature at Johns Hopkins University since 1930. Among his publications are *The High Ways to Perfection of Abraham Maimonides*, 2 vols. (New York and Baltimore 1937-38); *The Interpretation of the Bible in the Mishnah* (Baltimore 1935); *Our Heritage* (New York 1940).

MARK VISHNIAK was formerly professor of constitutional law at the Pedagogical Institute of Moscow and served as secretary-general of the Russian Constituent Assembly in 1918. After his emigration from Russia he was professor at the Russian School of Law in the Institut des Études Slaves and at the Franco-Russian Institute of Paris (1922-40); visiting professor at the Academy of International Law, The Hague, 1933; and editor-in-chief of *Sovremenniya Zapiski* (1920-40). He came to the United States in 1941 and is at present a member of the advisory committee of the Institute of Jewish Affairs and collaborator of the Yiddish Scientific Institute. Among his numerous publications the following are the most important: *Personality in Law* (Petrograd 1917, in Russian); *The Protection of Minorities in the International Treaties of 1919-20* (Paris 1920 in French, and 1926 in Russian); *The All-Russian Constituent Assembly* (Paris 1932, in Russian); *The Oppression of the Jews in Germany and the League of Nations* (Paris 1933, in French); *The International Status of Stateless Persons* (Paris 1934, in French); *Lenin* (Paris 1932); *Léon Blum* (Paris 1937); *Doctor Weizmann* (Paris 1939).

ISRAEL S. WECHSLER, chief neurologist at Mt. Sinai Hospital, New York, is clinical professor of neurology at Columbia University since 1931. His publications include *Text-Book of Clinical Neurology* (1927) and *The Neuroses* (1929) and numerous articles.

BERNARD D. WEINRYB, a native of Poland, received the Ph.D. degree from the University of Breslau (1931). He served as librarian of the Jewish Theological Seminary and of the University of Breslau from 1928 to 1932. He has lectured on the social sciences in Palestine and carried on sociological research on behalf of the Jewish Agency. In America he has been research fellow of the American Academy for Jewish Research and is at present director of the Jewish Teachers' Seminary in New York. His numerous scholarly contributions have appeared in many journals and in encyclopedias; among his works are *Studien zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Juden in Russland und Polen in 18-19. Jahrhundert* (1933) and *Neueste Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Juden in Russland und Polen* (1934). He is editor of the journal *Jewish Review*.







Kansas City  
Public Library



Presented to the Library by  
**Mr. Edgar Stern**  
to honor the 60th Birthday  
of **Mr. Millard Mayer**

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



124 659

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY